



THOSE WHO COUNT

Expert Practices of Roma Classification

Mihai Surdu



VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

THOSE WHO COUNT

THOSE WHO COUNT

*Expert Practices
of Roma Classification*

MIHAI SURDU



Central European University Press
Budapest–New York

Copyright © by Mihai Surdu 2016

Published in 2016 by

Central European University Press

An imprint of the
Central European University Limited Liability Company
Nádor utca 11, H-1051 Budapest, Hungary
Tel: +36-1-327-3138 or 327-3000
Fax: +36-1-327-3183
E-mail: ceupress@press.ceu.edu
Website: www.ceupress.com

224 West 57th Street, New York NY 10019, USA
Tel: Tel: +1-732-763-8816
E-mail: meszarosa@press.ceu.edu

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted,
in any form or by any means, without the permission
of the Publisher.

ISBN 978-963-386-114-1 cloth

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

Names: Surdu, Mihai.

Title: Those who count : expert practices of Roma classification / Mihai Surdu.

Description: Budapest : Central European University Press, 2015. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2015030129 | ISBN 9789633861141 (hardbound : alkaline paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Romanies—Government policy. | Romanies—Research. | Ethnicity—Government policy—Europe. | Classification—Political aspects—Europe. | Classification—Social aspects—Europe. | Census—Political aspects—Europe. | Social surveys—Political aspects—Europe. | Romanies—Public opinion. | Stereotypes (Social psychology) | Public opinion—Europe.

Classification: LCC DX145 .S87 2015 | DDC 323.11914/97—dc23

LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2015030129>

Printed in Hungary
Prime Rate Kft., Budapest

To Meita and Dora

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	XIII
INTRODUCTION	1
 CHAPTER 1: EPISTEMIC AND POLITICAL CLASSIFICATIONS	 13
1. CLASSIFICATIONS THAT MATTER	13
<i>Strengthening the object of study</i>	19
<i>Static and Variable in Roma classifications</i>	22
2. SCIENTIFIC INTERESTS AND POLITICAL RELEVANCE ...	24
<i>The political economy of knowledge production</i>	28
3. FROM EXPERT TO SELF-AScription	33
 CHAPTER 2: ETHNICITY THEORIES AND RESEARCH PRACTICES	 41
1. CONSTRUCTIVIST THEORIES VS. ESSENTIALIST PRACTICES	 42
<i>Ethnicity as a fiction made by science</i>	44
<i>The entrepreneurial side of ethnicity</i>	49
<i>Ethnicity as an artificial boundary</i>	52
<i>Ethnicity as an uncritical circulated category</i>	54

2. ROMA ETHNICITY MEASUREMENT IN SOCIOLOGICAL SURVEYS	58
<i>How Roma representative samples are made</i>	58
<i>Framing questions and interpreting findings in Roma-related surveys</i>	65
 CHAPTER 3: DISCIPLINARY TRADITIONS IN THE STUDY OF ROMA	71
1. FROM POLICE PROFILING TO POLICY RESEARCH PROFILES	72
2. ANTHROPOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL, AND LINGUISTIC ACCOUNTS OF ROMA	81
<i>Linguistics and historiography of Roma</i>	81
<i>Social history on Roma minoritization and stigmatization</i>	83
<i>Anthropological views on Roma origin: Exoticization and irrelevance</i>	87
3. ROMA IDENTITY BETWEEN ACTIVISM AND POLITICS ...	92
4. STUDIES ON ROMA DISCRIMINATION	99
 CHAPTER 4: ETHNICITY INSCRIPTIONS IN CENSUSES AND SURVEYS	105
1. THE CENSUS IN RACIAL POLICY REGIMES	107
<i>The Census in Nazi Germany</i>	107
<i>The Census in apartheid South Africa</i>	110
2. ETHNICITY INSCRIPTION IN MODERN CENSUSES	113
<i>Governmental practices of recording ethnicity in censuses</i>	114
<i>The Census as a tool of governance</i>	117
<i>Resistance to census categorization</i>	120
3. FROM FISCAL TO ETHNIC CATEGORIES AND FURTHER ON TO 'ETHNIC UNAVAILABLE'	122
<i>Gypsies as a social and fiscal category</i>	122
<i>Gypsies as an undercounted census category</i>	128
<i>Roma as an unavailable ethnic category</i>	132

4. PROBLEMATIC CONSENSUS ON THE ROMA UNDERCOUNT IN CENSUSES	139
5. REPRESENTATIVE SURVEYS SAMPLES BUILT ON UNREPRESENTATIVE CENSUS DATA	148
 CHAPTER 5: INFLUENCERS OF ACADEMIC AND EXPERT DISCOURSE ABOUT ROMA	153
1. A BIBLIOMETRIC APPROACH	153
2. INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF <i>ROMA</i> CATEGORY IN ACADEMIC DISCOURSE	157
3. DISENTANGLING INFLUENCE	162
4. WHO IS WHO IN EXPERT DISCOURSE ABOUT ROMA	168
 CHAPTER 6: CASE STUDIES ON ROMA-RELATED DISCOURSE	175
1. RECYCLING FRAMES IN WORLD BANK PUBLICATIONS (CASE STUDY 1)	180
<i>Cultural frames</i>	180
<i>Repetitio est mater studiorum</i>	184
<i>Selectivity of sources and assembling evidence in Roma-related research</i>	188
2. ROMA WELFARE DEPENDENCY: HOW REPRESENTATIONS ARE CREATED AND DISMANTLED (CASE STUDY 2)	192
<i>Unmaking public opinion</i>	197
3. GENETIC STUDIES: INTEREST IN ROMA ORIGIN(S) AND MOBILITY (CASE STUDY 3)	201
<i>Endogamy as a master narrative frame in Roma-related genetic papers</i>	205
<i>The unbearable generalization: From convenience samples to Roma population</i>	210
<i>Roma as subjects of medical genetic research</i>	215
4. "THE SUN IS A GYPSY STOVE" (CASE STUDY 4)	217

CHAPTER 7: VISUAL DEPICTIONS OF ROMA IN EXPERT PUBLICATIONS	223
1. READING PHOTOGRAPHY: PRETEXT, TEXT, AND CONTEXT	228
<i>Selection of photographs for analysis</i>	232
2. ROMA IMAGES IN POLICY LITERATURE	234
<i>Roma girl writing in a schoolbook</i>	234
<i>Children by the garbage dumpsite</i>	237
<i>The smoking Roma</i>	239
3. THE UNTOLD ROMA STORY OR THE REPRESSED NORMALCY	242
CONCLUSIONS	247
BIBLIOGRAPHY	255
INDEX	273

List of tables

Table 1. Estimates of Gypsies/Roma 1983, 1994 and 2007 by Liègeois	145
Table 2. Number of papers and average citations per paper by categories	166
Table 3. Non-academic publishers ranking by number of papers and citations	169

List of abbreviations

ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
CoE	Council of Europe
EC	European Commission
ERRC	European Roma Rights Centre
EU	European Union
FRA	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights
IRU	International Romani Union
NGO	nongovernmental organization
NIS	Romanian National Institute of Statistics
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
ONS	Office for National Statistics in the United Kingdom
OSF	Open Society Foundations
REF	Roma Education Fund
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNHCR	The UN Refugee Agency
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States
WB	The World Bank

Acknowledgments

As with any book, this one could not exist without the help of people and organizations. My work was supported by a grant of the Open Society Foundations, and I am most indebted to the Roma Initiatives Office program that generously granted me a fellowship for two years of researching and writing this book. My personal gratitude goes to Željko Jovanović and to Kinga Rethy who liked the book concept and encouraged its development. I am also grateful for their feedback and for the opportunity of engaging in a few meetings with Roma activists for discussing the ideas and the progress of the research. As a follow up of one of these meetings, I thank Valeriu Nicolae for his suggestion of being more direct in saying things and in bringing more examples; I have tried to do so. However, the direction in which the book has developed is entirely my responsibility, and my opinions and interpretations may substantially diverge from the viewpoints of those who supported me. It is for this reason that the encouragement that they constantly offered is more laudable.

During the period of writing the book and especially for the important stage of subsequent revisions, I benefited from a postdoctoral research grant from the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in Berlin (MPI), for the period of May–July and September–December 2014. In addition, I was granted a scholarship from the German Academic Exchange Program (DAAD) for August 2014, bridging my research stay at MPI. I am especially grateful to Professor

Veronika Lipphardt for reading the manuscript and providing careful feedback, for engaging and stimulating discussions about the relationship between genetics and social sciences, as well as for deepening my interest in the fields of history of science, and science and technology studies (STS). The help, support and appreciation of my work from Professor Lipphardt as well as her constructive criticism were essential stimuli for me in reworking the book manuscript, and having it finally, I hope, in much better shape than it was. During my stay at MPI, I have benefited from its vibrant academic environment and the opportunity to attend and to engage in dialogue with scholars from all over the world and from different disciplinary backgrounds. I would like to thank for the friendly and inspiring discussions to Judith Kaplan, Jenny Bangham, Sarah Blacker, Yuriditzi Pascacio Montijo, Pietro Rocca-secca, Stefano Bordoni, Sandra Grimes, and Alan Chalmers.

While located in Berlin, I met by chance professors Elena Mariushakova and Vesselin Popov with whom I had informal and warm discussions. I want to thank them for their openness and generosity in sharing their knowledge and views with me.

In revising the book, the feedback from CEU Press' peer reviewers was extremely valuable. I wish to thank in this regard Eben Friedman and Martin Kovats for their kind words sustaining my work as well as for their suggestions. I am thankful to Professor Marvin Lazerson from Central European University, who provided me with excellent advice for improving the flow of arguments by strengthening the appeal of the book for a wider scholarly audience beyond that of Roma experts. I was fortunate enough to benefit from the meticulous and creative editing work of Katya Dunajeva whose contribution helped a lot in improving the readability of the book. I wish to thank Katya here for her valuable work. I had the chance to do the final revisions of the manuscript during my fellowship with the Institute of Advanced Study (IAS) at the Central European University. I am grateful to the IAS staff for making my stay pleasant and efficient, and to my colleagues for engaging with my work, especially Călin Cotoi, William O'Reilly, and Mădălina Veres. Finally, I have to reiterate that views and opinions in this book are wholly my responsibility, and all eventual deficiencies resulting from the endeavor of the book writing are entirely attributable to the author.

My special thanks go to Laura and Mihnea for their incommensurable help during the stages from a project to a book. I was lucky

to benefit from the constant support of family and friends during the almost three years, while I have been working to write this book which haunted me for a much longer time. I dedicate this book to all those mentioned above and the many more not mentioned in loud voice, but acknowledged tacitly.

Introduction

This is not another book about Gypsies or Roma, how they currently are categorized. Instead, it is one about the history of their classification and about their classifiers. The interest in representing Roma is both scientific and political: science assumes to represent Roma as a research object by constituting Roma groupness through its various disciplinary branches, while political entrepreneurs assume their representation by instrumentalization of Roma into a political object. It is the aim of this book to point out the Roma-related scientific interests, which are at the same time epistemic and cliental, as well as the political interests, that are also terribly mundane if one considers money, power, academic, and managerial positions that circulate in political and academic networks within European and national bureaucracies, or within international organizations.

Although this book is written following a scholarly recipe, I consider myself neither a scholar, nor an activist but a *reader* of both types of accounts, so my critique is done from this point of view, that of a reader. I have to acknowledge, however, that the book is also an account of about 20 years of experience in Roma-related research. This experience is reflected in the text, which I see as a form of self-reflection on my previous work, and perhaps a point of departure from the strand of quantitative research that when divorced from social theory, becomes merely an empiricist craft. By emergence and development of a policy literature that appears to be written and, most impor-

tantly, to be further on cited as a collective organizational work, the literature about the Gypsies/Roma was anonymized, so that not an individual author is referred to, but a collective producer of reports, studies, and policy papers. This blurring of an individual authorship (as if the texts were not written by a human hand) and the fact that policy literature appears under organizational auspices gave it a plus of objectivity and authority, although a minus of responsibility. It is a usual practice for organizational reports and policy papers, including those about Roma, to have attached a disclaimer through which the content of publication is discarded of institutional responsibility, which is not assumed. The gradual disappearance of the author is also due to the fact that scientific papers on Roma are increasingly written by large teams of researchers—as the example of genetics scholarship demonstrates—which again makes the results of these research projects appear more solid and credible than those written by individuals.

Although I wrote this book from the position of a critical reader of Roma-related literature, at times I have been a writer or producer of research reports in various roles, such as lead researcher, consultant, editor, or research manager. On several occasions I have tried to raise some issues that I found disturbing in the research about Roma that I participated in, but my concerns lacked a public: on the one hand, one cannot speak to an organization, as it is an abstract entity, although led by concrete persons, and on the other hand, while making a research report there are so many parts involved that voicing concerns is not effective.

I have started to think about this book as my discontent with how the Roma are described and portrayed in policy research grew over time, and this discontent amplified further with reading more critical social theory as well as history and philosophy of science literature pointing to the social construction of collectivities. As a sociologist, I have been involved from the very beginning of my career in producing research about Roma with a double genuine motivation: first, I wanted to clarify for myself who Roma are, and second, I hoped that through my research I could engage myself in a wider process of social change, conducive to more equality and less social polarization. As a policy researcher, I have contributed to showing that segments of Roma pupils are segregated in the educational systems in countries from Central and Eastern Europe in substandard or special schools

for children with mental disabilities with dire consequences for their school career and for their future social success. This was a particularly challenging topic to address in my home country, Romania, where at the beginning of the year 2000 the concept of Roma educational segregation, that I have introduced through my research, initially perplexed both the academic and policy-making audience that I encountered. Although my research on Roma educational segregation was first received with a strong reservation, in a relatively short time, and as a consequence of international pressures, the issue was raised high on research and policy agendas. Yet my satisfaction as a researcher of putting the issue of Roma educational segregation on the policy agenda in my country and internationally was short lived; the more the issue became prominent and attracted more policy attention and financial resources from various governmental and European programs, the more the problem was there to stay, to be fixed and not to be solved. I became aware that my research on the educational segregation of Roma and many other similar types of research that followed it, had a double effect: on the one hand, it contributed to outlining the contours of a social problem around which a wide bureaucratic and administrative apparatus was formed, and on the other hand, the problem to be solved was paradoxically preserved, if not amplified, once the bureaucracy of Roma-related projects was put in place.

Nowadays there is a myriad of projects, big or small, local, national or Europe-wide, which gives strength to the administrative apparatus, but all these interventions were not getting even a bit closer to answering the problems they had aimed to. Since the institutionalization of the “Roma issue” and especially its Europeanization, I have been assisting and participating in several conferences, workshops, roundtables, and expert meetings that merely enhanced the talks about Roma—and in a way (re)created them in these talks—but real actions on changing the *status quo* seldom emerged. I then realized that policy research could and often does play just a performatory role, in which researchers act only to legitimate political discussions and not to address real social issues, let alone to change them. For sure, I was not alone in observing that policy research and political talks were ineffective, as many times during international meetings I discussed with my colleagues the organizational hypocrisy that replaced action with rhetoric. Yet, our concerns remained largely private and did not coagulate into public voice.

A second point of discontent with the policy research was that attention given by Roma-related studies concentrated not on the social actors and social mechanisms that create problems for Roma (and not only for them), but on the Roma themselves that increasingly became a special and preferred object of study due especially to policy research. Roma, as an object of study, and the representations of Roma in policy research became highly dependent on the political context and, consequently, who Roma are became a matter of political definition that researchers engaged in policy studies can only endorse and ratify, but not examine critically. Studies about Roma started to have very similar recipes and promoted a homogenous image of the Roma population as a whole, which began to circulate between different social and expert fields. What characterizes the policy studies of the last two decades are the highly repetitive Roma-related themes and, in conjunction with mass media production, the topics such as poverty, lack of education, unemployment, and welfare dependency, all these were transformed into an iconic depiction of Roma. When gradually I realized that policy research does not necessarily lead to its subjects' betterment, I was interested to find how other scholars regard the relationship between expert knowledge and interests, and, moreover, the relationship between expert and scientific truth and politics. I comprehended that the homogenous image of Roma heavily created by policy research was inaccurate because it is incomplete: on the one hand, not all individuals judged by the researchers as being Roma are thinking of themselves under this label, and on the other hand, the problems that are believed to apply exclusively to Roma are not relevant for all of them, but are also applicable to many of the so-called non-Roma. Thus, I came to realize that the best way to understand who the Roma are is not to analyze the Roma (as ethnic identity is contextual and fluid), but to look at their various classifiers (and especially to the expert categorizers) and to their modalities of objectification. The fact that the category of Roma is politically institutionalized through the contribution of expert knowledge is much more easily observable with the political regime change from socialism to capitalism in Central and Eastern Europe: while before 1990 Gypsies/Roma were not part of official and expert discourse, as was the case in Romania and Bulgaria for example, afterwards they became the main focus of political and scientific narratives.

In my endeavor from changing the attention granted to Roma as research subjects towards the classifiers of Roma, I engaged in readings about the processes of classification in expert and scientific practices and in the epistemology of social and natural sciences (because Roma are an object of study for genetics as well). I am indebted to those readings; there are too many authors that influenced me to be enumerated in this introduction, but I will retain here the most important ones. A first strand of studies is more general and not linked to Roma classifications, but nevertheless is an inspiring source for adopting some general ideas in my own work. A historical perspective affords an opportunity to examine the interrelations between epistemic and political authority that sustain the constitution of the Roma group as both an object of study and a target for policy intervention. These two aspects, the study of and the policy intervention on Roma, were never developed in isolation, but were supporting and reinforcing one another. Foucault's work on sexuality and madness, his views on authorship and his proposal for an archeology of knowledge as a method of inquiring into the nexus of knowledge/power involved in governmentality inspired me to take a *longue durée* perspective on the expertise on Roma. My own questions on the Roma's objectification relate to what Foucault (1984b) designates as "normalizing judgment": an expert gaze on the object of study that opens the space of comparisons, of producing classifications, making hierarchies, imposing a constant examination of those monitored, and settling the rules of adaptation for achieving conformity by those subjected to its inquiry. The reference work of Hacking (1983) also proved inspirational as it shows that scientific expertise has a double aim: to represent and to intervene. In fact, as I show in my analysis of Roma-related academic and expert discourse, it is the second aim (that of intervening and being useful to policymakers) that guides the way in which Roma are represented, hence epistemic considerations are secondary to those politically driven. As argued by Hacking (1986, 1995), classifications of human kinds produce a *looping effect* with real life consequences on people's lives. Those categorized are not only described, but the existence and dissemination of the classifications prescribe and circumscribe the acting potential of those typified. Several other academic works contributed to setting the stage for projecting my own topic: the critical scrutiny of classification practices inscribed in cen-

suses (Bowker and Star 2002; Kertzer and Arel 2002); the research confusion between categories of practice and categories of analysis as a source for reifying ethnicity (Brubaker 2004); and the role of scientists in constituting groupness by acting as spokespersons for the represented groups and entities (Callon 1986; Bourdieu 1991; Latour 2005). For the interest of geneticists in Roma as a “population isolate,” relevant both for human population genetics and for medical genetics, I found the concept of “biosociality” (Rabinow 1996) extremely useful. The concept of biosociality gave rise to a new paradigm and literature about how genetic research and social mobilizations that it produces contribute to the emergence of new individual and group identities, centered either around genetic diseases or risks, or around ideas of biological citizenship (Epstein 2007; Lipphardt 2012; Reardon 2005; Sommer 2010; Abu El-Haj 2012; Parfitt and Egorova 2006). A second strand of literature that I used in order to sustain my own arguments is related to the criticism of classifications of Roma as pursued in the fields of Anthropology and Romani Studies (Okely 1983; Stewart 1997; Acton 2006; Marsh 2007; Gay y Blasco 2008), social history (Lucassen, Willems, and Cottaar 1998; Willems 1997), political science (Klímová-Alexander 2005; Kovats 2002; Vermeersch 2006), and sociology (Ladányi and Szelényi 2001).

I found both readings, those on general classificatory practices and those specifically tied to Roma, useful to show that scientific and expert truth circulated by Roma-related research is conjectural, interested and highly dependent on the political regimes in power, and the way in which the experts and scientists classify people (including Roma) can have important consequences for those classified. One of the main consequences of the standardization of Roma identity is that those labeled as Roma internalize the scientifically constructed stereotypes, and this fact limits their expectations and often negatively influences their life course. Of course, there are also positive stereotypes in the expert and scientific production of knowledge on Roma, such as those related to artistic abilities and especially to music, which in a certain and limited extent could influence the life trajectory of some people for the better. But even these stereotypes that enhance Roma exceptionalism contribute to singling Roma out and narrowing down their qualities. Nevertheless, the balance of negative and positive stereotypical representations of Roma is inclined heavily toward the former.

Another consequence of the depiction of Roma in scientific and policy expert literature as an isolated, marginal, and even deviant population has the potential to raise the adversity of society against the Roma even more, to weaken the social ties and cohesion among different strata of society, and, by diverting focus from structural problems of the current economic system, to maintain the status quo instead of promoting social change. Acknowledging the implications of scientific categorization for people's private lives was the most significant trigger in driving me to write this book, and this time it was a positive one, which does not come from my disappointment with policy research, but from foreseeing its possible dangers. I became aware that policy research targeting Roma may do more harm than good. I hope that my book will be useful for those who self-ascribe as Roma, for those currently categorized as Roma who do not feel or do not think about themselves as such, and for those who claim to represent Roma at local, national, and international levels. Another audience of my book is that of experts and scientists that address Roma in their studies. I hope to add my contribution to a critical debate in this group of professionals that will lead to more reflexivity, to more prudence in assumptions, descriptions and methodological designs, and will start depoliticizing Roma ethnicity. I wish that this book can be also interesting for a much broader public of scholars, for social scientists interested in ethnicity and its social construction that can read it as a case study on this topic, but also for the scholars interested in processes of classification, as well as for science and technology studies (STS) and history of science scholars. I hope this last category of readers will find relevant the sections of the book that discuss the construction of the Roma category by censuses and surveys, the discourse analysis of Roma-related literature, the analysis of photography used to represent Roma as a group, as well as the critical reading of the genetic research after 1990. Last but not least, I wrote the book for those who, like myself, believe that a negative image of Roma was created and has to be analyzed, challenged, dismantled, and deconstructed.

The entry point into my topic brings to the forefront the issue of how scientific and expert knowledge are in general produced as a prerequisite for a contextual understanding of Roma-related knowledge production. In agreement with other authors, I argue in Chapter 1 that the issue of epistemic authority of the knowledge producer plays

a heavy role not only in assuring the circulation of knowledge, but also for rendering credibility to the truth claims. What is said about an epistemic object (as Roma became) matters but only in relation to whom it speaks. The consensus on the truth claims is built not only on content, but also on the *auctoritas* and on the opportunities to maintain and reinforce it. Science and technology studies (STS) show that for a truth claim to circulate and produce effects, it is necessary for problematizations advanced by scholars to find allies and support from other members of the scientific community, and also outside of it, in the practical field of governance (see, for example, Latour 1987). I revisit in this chapter some important landmarks of STS in order to argue that scientific knowledge is built, not discovered. Scientific knowledge is built by using a framing strategy, which means cutting off or building upon those problem definitions that are best suited for stirring consensus, and therefore for being accepted and credited by members of epistemic communities. Following Knorr-Cetina (1991), I emphasize that framing strategies that scientists use in producing truth claims are unavoidably accompanied by trade-offs or compromises that scientists should allow in order to make their epistemic object manageable and scrutinizable. No less important in analyzing knowledge production is to acknowledge its political economy: economic resources and symbolic prestige are often drivers of scientific problematizations. Relying on these STS insights, we can see the interest in Roma as an epistemic object, as driven by external factors such as access to resources, and also as being bounded by various research traditions invested in studying Roma. Ultimately, in order to be represented and approached, political and epistemic objects (such as the Roma category) are juxtaposed: these objects have to be rounded (by estimation), made homogenous (by categorization), visible (by photographic depictions) and coherent (easily identifiable).

If Chapter 1 points to how scientific knowledge is understood in STS, in Chapter 2 the main theoretical standpoints on ethnicity are revisited and contrasted with quantitative scientific practices employed in studying Roma. In this regard, what I hope to demonstrate is that while social theory of ethnicity relies on constructivist grounds and considers ethnicity as a moving target with no solid base other than its constitution by political entrepreneurs in the process of labeling, on the contrary most of the quantitative research on Roma relies on consid-

ering ethnicity as an objective and measurable fact. Moreover, I bring into discussion compelling arguments based on both social theory and empirical research to prove that the classification of Roma as currently done in policy research is based, in fact, on misrecognition, contrary to the way in which the research subjects themselves self-ascribe if they are given more options. As I show, what makes policy research on Roma encounter so many biases are mainly sampling strategies, but also other elements of the research design, such as recruiting subjects (including intrusiveness), framing of questions, the artificiality of the research situation and the interpretation, tacit or explicit, of the research findings.

In Chapter 3, I continue the analysis of research practices by looking at how Roma were framed as an object of study within particular scientific branches, such as linguistics, history, anthropology, political sciences, and, more recently, discrimination studies. The aim of this chapter is not so much to give an overview of these disciplinary fields, but to show the different perspectives under which Roma have been analyzed, and to point out the continuity of frames within certain research traditions as well as interdisciplinary borrowings. One of the central arguments of this chapter is that economic considerations played a crucial role in the justification of expertise on Roma issues throughout history, since the beginning of the classification of Roma in censuses and research. There were economic reasons for which Roma were enslaved in Romanian principalities in the Middle Ages; the same type of reasons caused them to be treated as asocials by Nazi scholars and administrators, and based on racial politics to be subjected for extermination. The contemporary period is characterized by the same economic motivation as in the Middle Ages: policy research targets Roma as a resource for “governmental investment” or as a welfare-dependent group. I follow two historians, Lucassen (1991, 1998) and Willems (1997), as well as the new and thriving field of literature on identification practices in showing that the police work of identification was instrumental for constituting Roma groupness. I go a step further in claiming that the logic of quantification and precise identification of Roma, although highly arbitrary, is to be seen as the root of contemporary Roma profiling in policy literature.

Research traditions diverge, as I show, in terms of framing Roma identity—while for historians the academics occupy front stage of the

categorization process, for political scientists the main actors are international organizations or Roma political activists. Bringing together these diverse perspectives gives more strength to the affirmation that Roma identity is co-constructed by both academic and political actors that bound the Roma group to their research traditions on the one hand, and to the organizational logic and interests on the other. Readers who are familiar with Romani Studies and research on discrimination of Roma can easily skip subchapters 2 and 4 of Chapter 3.

Chapter 4 analyzes population censuses in relation to ethnicity, arguing that the census is not a neutral tool for recording ethnicity but rather an inscription technology. In order to make this claim I briefly review literature on census practices in the racial policy regimes of Nazi Germany and apartheid South Africa, and point out the reasons behind racial censuses and categorizations as well as their terrible consequences on people's lives. I review further literature on modern censuses in different countries to present the difference regarding what censuses retained as ethnicity (and race) and inconsistencies in the construction of ethnic (and racial) categories.

I take a *longue durée* example to show how in Romania in official accounts Roma transformed from a fiscal category of population in the Middle Ages, to an ethnicity in the interwar period and further on, and with the help of a categorical exclusivist census and due to expert interpretations, into a non-ethnic category in the last 2011 census. I make an in-depth analysis of how the category of Roma was constructed in the 2011 census for showing that it does not map onto self-ascription. However, between the census and survey an intricate relationship was established when considering the Roma population's size; in this regard, I discuss contradictions between the experts' beliefs about the Roma population's undercount in censuses and their reliance on the census as a good descriptor of a Roma population profile. As I argue, expert consensus about the Roma undercount by census is problematic, as ethnicity by self-ascription is discredited in favor of some alleged objective characteristics (and therefore expert consensus alludes to essentialism).

Those interested in the specific contribution to the analysis of Roma-related literature of the last two decades can go directly to Chapters 5 and 6, which could be read as well as standalone parts of the book. In Chapter 5, I have made a bibliometric analysis of the

most influential papers and producers of Roma-related studies after 1990. I analyze a sample of 251 papers according to their influence on Roma discourse as established by their number of citations. Through bibliometric analysis I show which are the main disciplinary fields constituting academic and expert discourse on Roma, and discuss the most influential non-academic publishers that contribute or drive the Roma-related discourse. The main modalities of framing Roma and their resulting representations, as well as the methodological compromises related to these frames, are discussed in four case studies in Chapter 6. The first case study analyzes the main publications of the World Bank, as the leading producer of influential papers that constructed the mingling frames of Roma poverty and ethnicity; the second case study discusses the emergence of representations of Roma as a welfare dependent group in policy literature and eventually the deconstruction of this image within the same field; the third case study considers the field of genetics (very efficient in circulating Roma-related knowledge), and focuses on the reification of Roma in genetic studies through a selective knowledge transfer from social sciences and non-academic tradition as well as through sampling strategies. And the fourth case study reviews essentialist assumptions and methodological pitfalls of an intelligence testing academic paper that aims to justify the segregation of Roma in special schools. I move beyond discourse as text in Chapter 6 to addressing the representations of Roma as they appear in photos accompanying policy reports. By engaging with literature from visual sociology and bringing into discussion iconic images of Roma from policy literature, I purport to demonstrate that at the visual level Roma identity is reified too, and it is essentialized even more powerfully than in textual accounts. As for conducting research for this book, I had to enter fields that I was previously not familiar with (as for example genetics, epistemology, or philosophy of science); for experts in these fields passages of the book may seem superficial. Being aware of this lack of depth when striving for a broad and interdisciplinary approach, I considered nevertheless that the price of this superficiality is worth paying for the ability to scrutinize comprehensively the topic, and perhaps to broaden the audience of the book. Entering some new fields, as for example that of the literature on genetics, was a by-product of the research process, as I found that human population and medical genetics are important

contributors to the Roma-related discourse that I aimed to understand and further explain.

Maybe sometimes I thicken the lines of describing the expert and scientific literature on Roma in the last two decades, but how could I otherwise answer the much thickened lines in which Roma population was presented by the expert papers? Overall, I tried to be dispassionate and scholarly neutral, despite the fact that the disseminated images of Roma by expert and scientific literature is inviting a passionate reply, due to their far from flattering Roma representations.

Chapter 1

Epistemic and Political Classifications

1. CLASSIFICATIONS THAT MATTER

A vast amount of literary work, scientific papers, media news, legal and political documents have been written about Gypsies/Roma,¹ and probably a lot more will follow. Especially during the last two decades, there was an impetuous flow of research treating the Roma popula-

¹ I use both denominations of Gypsies and Roma (and often Gypsies/Roma) for their similarities of being totalizing classificatory labels, politically coined, and functionally interchangeable in public discourse and common perception. While Roma is the new politically correct term for referring to the long-in-use category of Gypsies, nevertheless, in speaking about Roma, the old frames of thinking about them as Gypsies are still in place and demonstrate a strong resilience. Accordingly, the use of dual terminology Gypsies/Roma denotes continuity in external categorization. The term “Roma” became gradually institutionalized in political and academic discourse after 1970, as a result of exchanges between international organizations and Roma activists (see Chapter 5 in this book). Previous attempts to mobilize those labeled as Gypsies under the appellative Roma were followed in the interwar period in Romania by ethnic-civic organizations. However, it was only late after 1990 that the term Gypsy was first replaced in policy documents and afterwards in most of the academic publications. Yet, social anthropologists and historians continue to use the label “Gypsies” in order to reflect the use of the name in different socio-historic contexts and for historical accuracy. Previous to these developments, the term Roma was used (and is still used) on a restricted sense as an ethnonym for one of the many subgroups that are subsumed currently under this label. In this sense, although the term Roma is a self-appellation of an ethno-cultural subgroup, it is foremost a political term, and in this acceptance it entered academic usage. Standing for

tion as an object of study. Most of the scientific work about Roma was drawn heavily from social science theories and methodologies. However, not only social sciences aim at constructing Roma as an object of study, but also natural sciences (genetics, for example) have increasingly paid attention to Roma. Thus, Roma arrive to be naturalized as a scientific object of study, and in turn the numerous branches of sciences that contributed to their objectification became legitimate in producing discourse about Roma.

Epistemic communities are probably the most appropriate concept for understanding the different groups of professionals having an interest in classifying and describing Roma, and, more importantly, those whose classifications of Gypsies/Roma matter. The concept of epistemic communities is defined by Haas (1992, 3) as follows: "An epistemic community is a network of professionals with recognized expertise and competence in a particular domain and an authoritative claim to policy-relevant knowledge within that domain or issue-area." While Haas' (1992) article seems to demarcate and contrast scientific with policy and political expertise, my view is that in the case of Gypsy/Roma classifications, these types of knowledge are difficult to disentangle, and the distinction between the two sorts of episteme are often blurred. Consequently, I will employ different substitute terms for the concept of epistemic communities, such as experts or professionals. This is my choice not only for semantic reasons, but also for further distinguishing among the different groups of experts involved in producing Gypsy/Roma classifications and descriptions. Yet, I believe the study of Haas (1992) rather indicates that the scholarly type of expertise sometimes permeates bureaucracies, but the two fields remain distinct. The role of scholars or academics is often merged with that of bureaucrats and civil servants, and both categories are using the same

self-identified ethnicity, it is also employed for classifying people who would not self-identify as such. Although the term is problematic, I use it throughout the book as referring to all those persons whom the label is applied to by scholars and policymakers, although only some of those labeled use the term as self-appellative. I am using the term Gypsies/Roma without any intention to offend individuals that identify themselves either as Roma or as Gypsies, but to analyze the classifications onto which they (and others who do not identify themselves with any of the two labels) are bounded by the classifiers.

methods in collecting and producing evidence in their activities. I consider the policy community as a specific type of epistemic community, which sometimes shares similarities with academic communities, as for example the field of public policy, which is regarded both as an academic discipline and a field of political intervention. An expert is a person who simultaneously plays the roles of researcher, political representative, activist, and bureaucrat, paying the price of superficiality for the performance in these multiple roles (Latour 2011).

These overlapping academic and political roles give credibility to the classification and descriptions of Roma, but in this juxtaposition between academic and political fields, it is the political one that prevails in producing knowledge about Roma. Therefore, it is the political field that constitutes Gypsies/Roma as a political entity (and creates a “Roma issue”), which afterwards is objectified by various academic disciplines during their search for attaining and reconfirming an expert status. It is obvious that the academic construction of Gypsies/Roma as an object of study is highly dependent on the political context; for example, under communist regimes in Romania and Bulgaria, there were little to no studies about Gypsies/Roma, or these studies did not refer to the contemporary people. Under these political regimes that do not single out Gypsies/Roma as a political object, we cannot find the Gypsy/Roma as a category of academic and expert discourse.

During the communist regime in Romania, for example, Gypsies were not present in the official discourse for more than four decades, although they were recorded in the census as *Țigani*, and, more importantly, the traditional communities were strictly monitored with the purpose of regulating their way of life (sedentarization of nomads, attaining full school enrollment and employment in state factories). The very few exceptions of studies about Gypsies/Roma that appeared at that time were historical accounts of Gypsy/Roma slavery or linguistic research on the Romani language, but even from those few studies most were published abroad.² Hungary makes an exception

² See, for example, the book of Sarău (1998) for the very few examples of linguistic works published before 1990. Gheorghe’s article about the slavery of Roma in Romanian principalities during the Middle Ages, a publication that appeared in the journal *Roma* in 1983, is a singular piece of sociological work published during the communist regime in Romania.

from the long silence of the academic community in relation to Roma during communism, yet the scientific production of such studies was small, compared to the period after 1990. Nevertheless, at a relatively slow pace, the academic knowledge production on Roma was developed in other former communist countries, such as the former Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia.

The increasing interest of the political class in defining and targeting Gypsies/Roma through policy measures after 1990 was accompanied by an extraordinary proliferation of academic and expert research, with Roma as an object of study. Taking again an example from Romania, a study by Mărginean (2001) analyzing 160 publications referring to Gypsies/Roma from 351 identified studies, found that about 96% of these studies were published after 1990, whereas during 1945–1989 just 1.5% were published of the total. In regard to the authorship of these publications, almost three quarters of the studies after 1990 were elaborated by experts affiliated with universities and research institutes, NGOs, international organizations, and different branches of the government; the main sponsors of these studies about Roma after 1990 were international organizations.³

In this historical dynamic of Gypsy/Roma-related studies highly dependent on the political context, one can see a proof that on the academic side the discourse follows the political interests in the objectification of Gypsies/Roma. Moreover, as I will illustrate later in Chapters 5 and 6, academic discourse about Roma is one of a second order, which is subsumed under and obeys the political interests of defining a Gypsy/Roma population that is described in opposition not to other ethnically carved groups from the social body, but to the very body of the society.

Illuminating this academically and expertly enacted opposition between Roma and society is the distinction drawn and the comparison made between *Roma* and *non-Roma*, where the second term stands for the society as a whole. This academically shaped division between Roma and non-Roma has a double effect of normalization (in Fou-

³ Among the most active international organizations in producing an expert literature on Roma were the World Bank, Council of Europe, Minority Rights Group, European Roma Rights Centre, European Commission, Project on Ethnic Relations and Open Society Foundations. I present a ranking of citations of papers on Roma produced by international organizations in Chapter 5.

cault's terms): on the one hand, Roma are standardized and averaged by statistical artifacts, so as to fit a profile of a marginal population that is to be seen as out of the "good" society. On the other hand, the society as a whole and its institutions, through this opposition of Roma – non-Roma, are assigned as functional, unproblematic and in no need for change. What this distinction suggests and builds upon is an alienated model of Roma, in which they are seen as a backwards population that has to catch up with an advanced mainstream society. After all, most of the contemporary studies about Roma point to Roma social integration, rather than to a change in societal power relations and institutions that sustain them: Roma are the ones who should adapt to the existing practices and institutions, rather than reviewing and transforming the collective patterns of thought and political actions that lead to the constant formation and exclusion of marginal groups. The division between Roma and non-Roma points out the appropriateness of social structures built in institutions, such as schools or the labor market, resulting in the argument that the majority society performs well in these institutions. Accordingly, the fault of Roma misperforming is not seen as a matter of structural exclusion, but one of misadaptation to the otherwise generally accepted rules of conduct of a reasonable, if not good, society and its institutions. The division between a marginal group and a mainstream society is the result of what Foucault (1984b) describes as *normalizing judgment*. The "normalizing judgment" is made by the experts on their object of study in order to open the space of comparisons, produce classifications, make hierarchies, impose a constant examination of those monitored, and settle the rules of adaptation for achieving conformity by those subjected of inquiry (Foucault 1984b).

The association of Gypsy/Roma-related studies with political regimes raises the issue of knowledge as a by-product of political willpower. In this regard, the concept of a *regime of truth* developed by Foucault (1984c) suggests that certain types of discourse are possible and considered valid only in particular societal constellations and political arrangements. The truth itself is indistinguishable from power, and it is particular and not universal as it is tied to a specific society; moreover, it should pass the test of a politically validated knowledge in order to be able to assert itself as truth. The concept of a "regime of truth" in Foucault's work resolutely relates the issue of knowledge to

that of discourse, and particularly with a form of discourse legitimated by the political powers of time:

Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (1984c, 72–3)

Following the concept of “regime of truth” and applying it to the scientific and expert discourse about Roma, it may be inferred that what is said about Roma is nothing else than a political truth, limited in time and space by the modalities of expression made possible by a political class and by a political system: when some communist regimes had no place for Gypsies/Roma in their official discourses, scientific knowledge production about them was also lacking; transitional regimes that succeeded in former communist countries and opened the space for asserting Roma as a category and as an ethnicity, were prolific in scientific knowledge about them. Nevertheless, scientific and expert knowledge about Roma has been created for a long time since, at least for more than two centuries, under the guidance of authorities of different regimes.

Historically, in the Middle Ages the scholars' roles have emerged from the literate segments of populations who occupied functions in church or state organizations, so different categorizations of Gypsies in historical records should be understood as having been drawn from types of classifications produced by episteme-like communities entitled with authority.⁴ Throughout history, Gypsy/Roma categorizations were endorsed by elites that aimed to distinguish and differentiate themselves from those they classified. The classifiers and the classified were always,

⁴ Many historical works about Gypsies/Roma (see, for example, authors such as Okely 1983; Lucassen 1991; Willems 1997; Mayall 2004; Marsh 2007) point out that historiography about Roma was created by scholars having neither the social status nor the cultural allegiances with the groups they described.

and with necessity, standing in distinct categories (social, economic, and political), and this separation which allows Roma objectification is observable also in today's research that is conducted from the exterior of the so-defined group. The discourse and classification of the marginal, excluded, and minorities are uttered from the centers of power, becoming a discourse of the power about the less powerful and not an auto-referential discourse. Gypsy historiography traces back to primary sources, such as administrative documents, tax records, church documents, and other papers issued *in illo tempore* by official authorities and scholarly work.⁵ All these historical documents coming from administrative sources are presented by scholars and experts as objective sources for Gypsy historiography, and often are the only sources because Gypsies were not part of the literate elite during the time when the illiterate condition was the norm.

To sum up, reference to Gypsies in the administrative documents of the Middle Ages is an instrumental type of codification of the shared beliefs and interests of a class of administrators that fulfilled various clerical and state-related functions in society. Thus, categorization of Gypsies and later Roma should be seen in its historical context, in order to understand and assess the epistemic claims made by authorities that led to the social formation of the group. For example, in Romania the Gypsy status was codified by law into a slave status as a result of the fact that the prevalent view among the elites of the time was that a society based on slavery (of those seen as the outsiders, such as Gypsies and Tatars) would be desirable. It is therefore the consensus of an elite about a type of society that made the procedure of legal inscription of slavery possible. During the Middle Ages in Romanian principalities, for example, Gypsies couldn't be legally ascribed the status of slave if anterior to this ascription elite opinions in regard to the suitability of slavery would not have circulated.

Strengthening the object of study

While in the past classification of Gypsies was done by a small elite, currently Gypsies/Roma continue to be a reference for classification but for multiple and diversified epistemic communities (such

⁵ For a criticism of primary sources in Gypsy historiography, see Okely (1983).

as scholars, scientists, journalists, NGOs and policymakers) interested in describing Gypsies/Roma. Even if opinions on and classifications of Roma today have less legal power than in the past (although in some cases they still have, such as the psychological categorization that assigns Roma pupils to special schools), nevertheless they remain as authoritative as in the past, and produce consequences for those categorized.

Epistemic communities also include other types of groups, with the condition of being part of the contemporary elite, and consequently enjoying society's appreciation: "Epistemic communities need not be made up of natural scientists; they can consist of social scientists or individuals from any discipline or profession who have a sufficiently strong claim to a body of knowledge that is valued by society" (Haas 1992, 16). Moreover, in some cases, epistemic communities transcend national boundaries as a result of professional cooperation related to research, its prerequisites in terms of communication, and its products, such as books, articles, research reports, conference papers, etc. (Haas 1992). The transnational character of epistemic communities is worth emphasizing because, as I argue in the analysis of influence in expert and scientific literature about Roma in Chapter 5, the constitution of international teams of researchers and other types of professionals is dependent on the conceptualization of their object of study as a transnational population transcending national borders. In other words, if Gypsies/Roma are to be found all over the world, then scientific collaboration among experts/specialists/professionals increases, and the establishment of transnational expert teams is facilitated by an object of study, which is everywhere *at home*. A shared common object of study justifies the existence of international expert teams and the globalization of expertise in "Roma issues." Because of shared beliefs that Gypsies/Roma are the same object of study all around, situations when teams of Western experts make field research in Balkan countries or in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) are frequent. The mere fact that Western expert teams could properly understand and give advice about Gypsies/Roma from CEE strengthens the idea that Gypsies/Roma are everywhere the same, irrespective of social, economic, and cultural contexts. Although there are Western experts that understand the region and the topic they are working on well, many of them have little or no knowledge about those whom

they are studying, and usually they spend little time in the field. Consequently, transnational collaboration in epistemic communities reinforces the salience of Roma and their visibility as an out-group with a clear and easy to define specificity and having unequivocal features. Only a common and shared object of study (and policy advice), as Gypsies/Roma became, could justify such a very expensive infrastructure related with international collaboration of the teams of experts all over the world.

Under the influence of epistemic communities together with pressures from the Romani movement, the policy-making bodies, such as governments, international organizations, and the bodies of the European Union (EU), adopted essentialist definitions and classifications of Gypsies/Roma and, consequently, developed inappropriate essentialist policy answers. Only to take a single example, through the European Roma Strategy, the European Commission (EC) made a policy requirement to the EU member states, which demands primary school completion by all Roma in the countries of the EU. The level of primary education completion is set up as an objective to be reached despite the fact that in some countries, as, for example, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Hungary, participation in primary education is already quasi-achieved for Roma (e.g., Friedman 2013). Hence, the conceptualization of Roma as a consistent and homogenous group that shares the same educational premises and contexts could prove a misleading objective for policies and contribute to keeping down the group as a whole. Analysts of national strategies for Roma integration criticized the high degree of similarity among the strategies and programs targeting Roma that have been developed in the former communist countries (e.g., Marushiakova and Popov 2011). This similarity in targeted policies on Roma indicates a process of group thinking in close communities of experts that favor a top-down type of approach in developing public policies. The process of group thinking contributes not only in constituting a target group for policies but, as Fleck ([1935]1979) demonstrates, “thought collective” (Denkkollektiv) is essential for the creation of scientific facts and epistemic objects..

Although there is a consensus in the views of expert communities, who contribute to constructing Gypsies/Roma as a unitary group and encompassing category, these views of experts are often in contradiction with the knowledge of people who are so categorized. For

example, groups of people who are acknowledged under the category of Roma are pertaining to communities that identify themselves as Egyptians and Ashkali (in Macedonia, Kosovo, and Albania) and Boyash or Rudars (in Romania, Serbia, Croatia, and Hungary). Moreover, people who are categorized in France, for example, under the label of *gens de voyage* may prove to have been stable for generations in the same locality and without the opportunity to travel outside their locality of birth.⁶ The categorization of Gypsies/Roma is instrumental and made by elites who shape the boundaries of the group so as to fit with their professional interests.

Static and Variable in Roma classifications

Gypsy/Roma as an epistemic object has traversed history as a result of reinforcement of some characteristics that supposedly are unique to Roma and account for their differentiation. The concept of *immutable mobiles* developed by Latour (1986, 1987) is helpful for understanding how scientific knowledge is produced, and for accounting for the continuities and transformations of Roma as an epistemic object. It also allows one to disentangle both what has been preserved from the earliest scholarly attempts to define the group and what has been added in re-fashioning it. Scholars, scientists, and experts have produced visualizations such as numbers, graphs, categories, lists, and taxonomies: all these things make their object visible and stable, but at the same time mobile enough to be transported from one context to another in order to reclaim objectivity (Latour 1986). Stabilizing the epistemic object relies on multiple transformations and operations of import-export from one field to another and from one context to another.

The classification as Gypsies, and later on as Roma, answers to a range of needs and interests of the classifiers constituted by epistemic communities. These classifications are a result of purposeful work of different professionals from institutions and organizations, sometimes with divergent classificatory interests, because each epistemic commu-

⁶ I thank Željko Jovanović for bringing this example to my attention. During face-to-face discussions with people labeled as *gens du voyage* in France, he found that some of them have never left their localities of residence. This is a very illustrative case of labeling being decoupled by reality.

nity tried to appropriate Gypsies/Roma as an object of its own sphere of influence. Different types of actors assign the Gypsy label to individuals or to groups of people as to fit with their interests: the fiscal authorities legally defined them as slaves; religious leaders applied religious denominations to them, such as *Athingani* or *pagans*; scholars relegated them for about two centuries to an Egyptian and after that to an Indian origin; police representatives and criminologists classified them as deviants and criminals; eugenicist scholars delineated them as a dysgenic group; state administrators codified them as linguistic groups and ethnic minority; demographers assigned them as an ever growing young population based on the extended family model; policymakers defined them as nomads, poor and welfare dependents; psychologists often classified Roma children in the category of low IQ; writers and artists made up a bohemian character for them; Roma politicians considered them as ethnic voters; and representatives of non-governmental and international organizations defined them as a target group.

Among all these types of experts, which assign a label and give significance to Gypsies/Roma as a category, academics/scholars have been the most prolific in categorizations. The different classifications of Gypsies have a relatively high consistency for the users of a particular community of experts and scientific practices in which the classification was created. However, the meaning attributed by the authors of classifications from a specific expert community remains obscure for users from other fields: for instance, Roma subgroups constructed by ethnological classifications may have no relevance for the statistical and sociological totalizing approaches. Sometimes classifications as Gypsies and/or Roma could be difficult to understand for the classified subjects, as for example in the case of censuses and sociological surveys in which the subjects consider themselves Gypsy but not Roma, or Roma but not Gypsy, or neither of the two; yet, they have been classified under one category, that of Roma.

By far the most prolific and long established field that constitutes Gypsies/Roma as the object of study is ethnology. This discipline is rather tied to the realist⁷ position by discovering and ordering varieties

⁷ I discuss in the next subchapter the tension between realism and nominalism, which is an essential topic for divergent epistemological positions.

of Roma groups and subgroups according to their way of life, customs, language, relationships between groups and subgroups, as well as relationship with the dominant society. That ethnologic work was regarded at times as less scientific is the result of the equivalence that some researchers draw between ethnologists and folklorists. Far from being a derogatory term, the term “folklorist” designates those academics who are describing with minutia the different habits and customs of groups seen as traditional and, in this regard, very different from the mainstream society. Through ethnologic work, Roma classifications fall most often in the definition of being mainly a cultural group, sharing certain common elements of group solidarity due to shared elements of a cultural complex. Yet if for ethnologists there is a cultural determinism that encloses the Roma group, for other types of professionals other types of bounding apply, as for example the tying of Roma (explicit or implicit) to an underclass by sociologists or their biologization by geneticists and physical anthropologists.

2. SCIENTIFIC INTERESTS AND POLITICAL RELEVANCE

Academic work has a strong influence on public perception by representing Gypsies/Roma with the help of tools of classification and measurement. The thoughts and views that we have about Gypsies/Roma, and sometimes that they have about themselves, if not merely a reflection of a fantastic scientific production, are at least influenced by it. Gypsy/Roma ethnicity as a case of social construction could be explored by reviewing some ideas of the constructivist current in the epistemology of science, and in particular of social sciences. For an understanding of the academic construction of Gypsies/Roma through classificatory practices, an instrumental selection of constructivist ideas about science in general could prove useful. One of the main precepts of the constructivist perspective is that scientific theories in natural sciences, but also in social sciences are, a *particular* case of knowledge⁸

⁸ Burke (2012, 4) argues that knowledge should be rather considered in plural (knowledges) given the particularism of viewpoints of the knowledge producers. Feyerabend ([1975] 2010) tackles the issue of particularism of scientific knowledge by arguing that it dislocates other knowledge, such as common knowledge.

that resulted from the specific cultural practices of a scientific community, whose time-bounded scientific objects are outputs of the work of cultural production.

One of the key questions that constructivists continuously try to answer is how our reality is constructed. As an answer to this question, scholars of history and philosophy of science often affirm that scientific production is embedded in its social and economic context, and hence conditioned by its environment. The reality appears to be constructed in a pseudo-autonomous scientific system, which is in fact strongly dependent on the economic resources. In this regard, the system of knowledge production could be hard to disentangle from the social and economic determinants, despite the fact that the various systems of the social tend to autonomize themselves in their logic of functioning (e.g., Luhman 1998). More trenchant views on the embeddedness of science in society affirm that in fact there is no separation between science and society (Latour 1987), but scientific knowledge is the result of alliances and networks co-interested in sustaining world-views that become certified *a posteriori* as long as networks that sustain them are functional.

The cultural production of scientific knowledge is also affected by the scientists' beliefs, which shape their outputs. One particular set of scientific beliefs that splits the scientific community is that between nominalism and realism. For those who subscribe to nominalist beliefs, the objects are real only insofar as they are defined as real, whereas for realists, the objects derive their real status from their independent and objective existence, irrespective if we name them or not. A shortcut to the debate between realism and nominalism (as a kind of anti-realism) in the epistemology or in the philosophy of science is ironically expressed by Hacking when, in an experimental laboratory, he asked a physician about his experiments related to electric charges of positrons and electrons: "Now how does one alter the charge of the niobium ball? 'Well, at that stage,' said my friend, 'we spray it with

In the same direction, Latour (1987) sustains that there are no cognitive differences between scientific knowledge and common knowledge, and between supposedly universal scientific knowledge and local common knowledge; he uses the example of cartography that studies "native" knowledge of territories in order to incorporate it in expert knowledge of map-production.

positrons to increase the charge or with electrons to decrease the charge.’ From that day forth I’ve been a scientific realist. *So far as I’m concerned, if you can spray them then they are real*” (1983, 23; emphasis in the original). Simply put, for the natural sciences community realists are those who believe that what is observable is real, while anti-realists are those who believe that objects are made real by the human descriptions and definitions attached to them.

In opposition to the natural sciences, the object of study of social sciences and humanities and of human genetics are not electrons, positrons or quarks, but human beings, so my interest is to see how this dispute between realism and nominalism translates into social sciences. *Mutatis mutandis*, the realists see Gypsies/Roma as a scientific object that should be explored by quantification, and they assume that the role of science is to precisely define and measure the Gypsy/Roma entity as accurately as possible. On the one hand, the “progress” of science in Roma-related studies is seen as consisting of the development of quantitative methodologies that could approximate the complete registration and measurement of Gypsy/Roma individuals and in the description of their characteristics as a social aggregate. On the other hand, the advancement of a nominalist view on Gypsies/Roma consists of highlighting the social construction of the group to which academics and policymakers contributed.

One of the main issues in the sociology of knowledge is how the scientists know whether their knowledge is not merely a truth of a group of people sharing a common set of values, beliefs, and practices that are in no way universal, but tied to their specific scientific culture. Translated to my own inquiry, the questions are whether the actual scientific descriptions, explanations, and classifications of Gypsies/Roma are something that should be entirely taken at face value; what the role of group thinking is in the case of policy experts and how the circulation of “immutable mobiles” among different social fields produces knowledge. In addition, I aim to answer the question of how the conceptualization of Roma in the last two decades became an unquestioned and unquestionable orthodoxy of academic and political establishment. A second and different line of inquiry is related to the construction of knowledge about Roma with flawed methodologies and for the purpose of answering political needs, as is the case with most of the policy research about Roma. As I will discuss further in Chapter 6,

numerous scientific biases resulted from inappropriate methodologies and from the lack of theoretical guidance, and could be encountered in research having Roma as an object of study.

The “progress” of scientific knowledge is achieved through production of stereotypes and their subsequent revision. The same happens with the scientific and semi-scientific production of studies about Roma that follow the same rules of producing and revising stereotypes. Hacking (1983, 77) uses the term stereotype for referring to “a conventional idea associated with a word, which might well be inaccurate.” In this context, a stereotype means to maintain a reference to an object through a word, even if what is shared by a community of scientists is only the reference, but not the meaning of the object they refer to. The stereotype extracts the characteristics of the object, which are considered essential for the recognition of the object. This extraction of (supposedly) essential characteristics makes many other characteristics, which are considered not essential, left out as irrelevant for the description of the object. In the scientific and semi-scientific knowledge production about Roma, some essential characteristics were extracted (accurately or not) and permanently reinforced, thus the reference (Roma) is recognized by the strength of the stereotypes related to it.

The issue of *who Roma are* is debated in elite circles of various branches of sciences, for building up scientific legitimacy in the field of sciences or for validating an expert status in policy-making. In regard to establishing a viewpoint about Gypsies/Roma, increasingly geneticists took the lead in defining Roma groupness by trying to settle or mediate disputes that were opened within social sciences. In the meantime, while the status of social sciences is rather at the bottom of the hierarchy of sciences (e.g., Bourdieu 1975), genetic knowledge becomes more and more important for the large public, and it is equated with objectivity. Addressing the issue of dominance in the scientific field is relevant because during the last two decades it was the genetic disciplines (population genetics and molecular biology), which have been actively involved in establishing knowledge, deemed to be both relevant and objective in relation to Gypsies/Roma. Nevertheless, population genetics papers about Roma seem to use population profiles crafted by social researchers and, more generally, their object of study is most often simply imported from the social sciences. Taken

from the descriptions of the social sciences or taken for granted, the Roma group becomes an *a priori* category of genetic research, and after multiple operations of transformation, its existence is established or (re)confirmed in an *a posteriori* genetic category that mirrors the initial social category.⁹

The political economy of knowledge production

An important question for the sociology of science is “whether scientific consensus is formed solely on the basis of evidential considerations” (Knorr-Cetina 1983, 116). The production of truth in the epistemic cultures, as Knorr-Cetina (1991) argues, is developed by scientific communities with the help of two basic strategies—*framing* and *trade-offs*. The strategy of framing means to use the theories developed in a specific scientific field and to appeal to practices of evidence, finding, and validation built up by the research traditions of that particular scientific field. The trade-offs are the compromises that deviate from an ideal standard, and that a scientist has to make in employing the specific practices of searching for evidence because of constraints related to limited resources, such as time, money, and attention, or due to other “external” constraints. The two strategies for scientific truth production are in fact closely tied (Knorr-Cetina 1991). Later on, I will exemplify the issues of *framing* and *trade-offs* as devices of knowledge production about Gypsies/Roma in the discussion of sampling strategies used in Roma-related research surveys.

There could be distinguished three complementary strands in which the sociology of science has been engaging so far: the interest model, the scientific controversy approach, and the ethnographic perspective (Idem 1983). The first path of studies in the sociology of science is the so-called *interest model*, which is a perspective focused on the political economy of the scientific process and its outputs. This interest model assumes that essential drivers of the scientific process are establishing influence and its translation into scientific credibility, which in turn is a symbolic resource granting access to economic

⁹ A more detailed discussion about genetics’ contribution to the establishment of the broader field of studies about Roma is made in Chapter 6 (case study 3).

resources and social prestige. As a subsystem of the capitalist economy, the scientific field itself works in the economic logic of capitalism, and, accordingly, it functions as a scientific market in which the concepts of profit, supply, and demand are applicable. Gaining scientific authority and recognition is what motivates the researchers and, accordingly, the production of scientific knowledge. As Bourdieu points out, “Scientific authority is thus a particular kind of capital, which can be accumulated, transmitted, and even reconverted into other kinds of capital under certain conditions” (1975, 25). Seeing scientific interest as merely extrinsic to the accumulation of social capital convertible to other forms of capital would be a mistake, since there is also an intrinsic motivation of scholarship oriented towards knowledge production. However, the intrinsic motivation oriented towards knowledge production is hard to disentangle from the extrinsic interest, insofar as defining one’s work as a scholarly result of an activity necessarily implies an involvement of scholars in establishing scientific authority in political struggles of recognition and legitimation in the academic field (Bourdieu 1975). Acknowledging the commodification of science and the increased performativity of scientific enterprise, Lyotard questions the basic pursuit of scientific activity in capitalist society: “The question (overt or implied) now asked by the professionalist student, the State or institutions of higher education is no longer ‘Is it true?’ but ‘What use is it?’ In the context of the mercantilization of knowledge, more often than not this question is equivalent to: ‘Is it saleable?’” ([1979] 1992, 51).

Roughly put, extra-scientific interests, such as securing money for research work and establishing the scientists’ own credibility and legitimacy in scientific competition are important factors driving scientific production of knowledge, as part of scientific process and not external to it (e.g., Latour 1987). Academic research about Roma makes no exception from this embeddedness of scientific activity in its economic and social context. Simhandl’s (2006) article retraces the trajectory of Roma as a political object in the EU discourse: the Gypsies and Travellers in Western Europe and Roma in the East. Policy categories, devised by bureaucracies and political actors, circulate a Roma reference among scientific fields because researchers seek to find policy relevance and financial support, and because they need infrastructural support for sampling a population. Such societal

and political resonances make the Roma category even more plausible for both researchers and decisionmakers. In many cases, what is to be known and to be researched about Roma comes pre-established by the terms of reference (TORs) that are prepared by political institutions financing the Roma-related research. Therefore, especially in policy research (but increasingly in academic research as well, where attracting funds for universities is becoming the norm) the basic research assumptions about Roma are initially politically framed and afterwards endorsed and ratified by the researchers.

The second direction in the sociology of science has as a main topic the exploration of scientific controversies. This is an approach which makes the ways in which scientific consensus is developed in groups of scientists visible and explores how the truth become established as a result of this group consensus. Inside of this direction of exploring scientific controversies could be placed the *actor-network theory*, which is a perspective that follows in the footsteps of the actors that define the social for exposing their attempts to stabilize social controversies by scientific means. The attempt to reassemble the social through scientific accounts and divergences means paying attention to the “travel guides” or to the methodological apparatus employed by scientists for guiding their readers on the paths of travelling and seeing (Latour 2005). Why do Roma-related studies not make their travel guides (methodologies) public? And when they do, why do they always travel on the same beaten roads and close down other possible avenues? More importantly, what the actors say about themselves may diverge from what the scientists or experts acknowledge in their scientific endeavors. Groups are made by social scientists in their scientific practices but are also (re)created by the actors themselves, not necessarily on the same alignments: “Group delineation is not only one of the occupations of social scientists, but also the very constant task of the actors themselves. Actors do the sociology for the sociologists and sociologists learn from the actors what makes up their set of associations” (Latour 2005, 42).

After all, the spokespersons transform themselves into actors; therefore, in my inquiry following the actors in their Roma-related controversies equally means following what Roma as actors are saying about themselves, as well as what their spokespersons—experts and scientists—say. Experts and scientists assume the role of spokesper-

sons for groups that they describe through research, and this scientific enterprise calls the group into being (Callon 1986; Bourdieu 1991; Latour 2005).

Another term for following the resolution of social controversies within the scientific field is that of the *sociology of translation*, the term being coined for describing “a general process called translation, during which the identity of actors, the possibility of interaction and the margins of manoeuvre are negotiated and delimited” (Callon 1986, 202). In the sociology of translation as well as in the actor-network theory, the accent is placed on the roles assumed by scientists in looking for and mobilizing allies in order to sustain their research problematization, namely their particular way of representing a situation or an entity and making their representation seen as valid in a community interested in the same issues. Scientists act as spokespersons for groups of which they are not representative, and play the role of intermediaries between the groups that they describe and society; the groups (and entities) are instituted by the power of the scientists: “... the groups or populations in whose name the spokesmen speak are elusive. The guarantor (or the referent) exists once the long chain of representatives has been put into place. It constitutes a result and not a starting point” (Callon 1986, 211). Mobilizing allies is such a crucial issue that scientific texts in their politics of references may appeal even to perfunctory citations (Latour 1987), in order to build coalitions that sustain their problematization. In this regard, the construction of scientific facts have the same character with coalition-building in politics: seeking alliances, annihilating opponents, appealing to strategies of rhetoric and persuasion for consolidating beliefs and elevating the status of these beliefs from opinion to a fact.¹⁰

Finally, the third course of the sociology of knowledge is that of the ethnographic approach (Knorr-Cetina 1983), a micro-perspective in which the sociologist descends directly into the laboratory site for observing scientific beliefs and practices as embedded in daily work. In this approach, the sociologists’ role is similar with that of an anthropologist observing “primitive” cultures, except now his population

¹⁰ See Latour (1987) for an analysis of strategies of the construction of scientific facts.

consists of the scientists and scientific cultures, and the ways in which scientists see and do things.¹¹

To sum up, in the sociology of science the interest model follows the networks of scientific professionals and their managerial-political behavior for appropriating economic resources for their work; the scientific controversies model pursues the logic of settling disputes and arriving at a consensus in epistemic debatable issues; and the ethnographic approach follows the daily routines of scientific practices used in the production and dissemination of scientifically accepted truths.

Since I was inspired in writing this book by social constructivist literature,¹² I disclose the assumptions of my work from the beginning: (1) Roma identity is taken for granted in quantitative research produced for the purposes of public policy. (2) Roma public identity is not necessarily as it is currently described. Representations of Roma are to be found at the intersection between the revival of an object of study and the intervention of public policies, plus mobilization of the (transnational) identity project of Romani activists. (3) Roma identity circumscribed by current representations appears as negative. The Roma profile, as described by science, policy research, and mass media, is one in which stereotypes prevail. (4) Those labeled as Roma would have more to gain if their public representation would be de-essentialized and unbiased. As a corollary, an unbiased presentation of Roma, detached from political or scientific representations, would offer people more opportunities for an autonomous construction of self.

Roma activists and scholars have their role in reproducing and reinforcing a stereotyped and negative Roma identity. Roma activists build a weak Roma identity through their advocacy actions, which in fact mirrors a negative generalized Roma group image: “[Roma activists/minority advocates] construct a particular sectional minority identity that not only fails to give full expression to individual identities, but is usually also ‘stigmatized’ in the sense that it is popularly associated with standard stereotypical images and negative characteristics” (Vermeersch 2005, 451). It is the perniciousness of ethnic policies and politics to sooner or later trigger ethnic conflict, which leads me to

¹¹ A classical example of the ethnographic approach to the sociology of knowledge is that followed by Latour and Woolgar (1986).

¹² For the model of assumptions in constructivist papers, see Hacking (1999).

suggest that the scholarly community and policymakers should de-ethnicize (in the sense of de-essentialize) Roma identity. In other words, being Roma should be a free choice, not an imposition with a prescriptive rule of conduct coming from the outside. In this regard, free choice means to choose, or not choose, a self-affiliation to an ethnic group and to denounce an *a priori* binding to a group.

In my subsequent analysis, I focus on the path of exploring scientific controversies and scrutinize how scientific disputes about Gypsies/Roma are solved inside different disciplines of the scientific field, how these disputes are transferred for resolution from a scientific field to another in search of a higher degree of authority (as, for example, from linguistics to anthropology, and from anthropology to genetics), and how consensus is established by interdisciplinary work, despite the fact that data do not necessarily fit the scientifically crafted Gypsies/Roma classifications. Moreover, I claim that scientific discourse about Gypsies/Roma is secondary to the political discourse, or co-constructed with it, and that Roma are constituted as a scientific object in dialectic interplay with Roma as a political object.

3. FROM EXPERT TO SELF-AScription

I remember one of my first experiences from my university years as a field operator, employed by a prestigious international marketing and research company for doing a survey about Roma. I was paid to fill out a number of questionnaires addressing subjects who self-identify as Roma. To my questions for clarifying respondents' ethnicity, as required by the research protocol, in many cases people answered: "You may circle what you think is good to be noted down." When I insisted on a clarification because I had to circle one ethnic category on my sheet, they moved on: "You may circle what is good for you," or "Circle something to be good for everybody." In some other cases, I have been given the following answer: "We are Gypsies only by the name [not in reality], but you circle what you think is appropriate," or "We are *Rudari* and not Gypsies" (the category *Rudari* did not appear in the questionnaire, so I could not record such an answer). Having a number of questionnaires per day to fill out in order to accomplish the task, I had to finally decide for myself whom to circle as Roma

and, moreover, I had to do this quickly. From this personal experience it was obvious for me that the researchers are working with pre-elaborated research categories, having little or no correspondence in real life, and the so-called self-ascription in quantitative research about Gypsies/Roma is in fact a decision taken by outsiders and not merely noted by them. This example is important because it highlights the arbitrariness of a category (that is exclusive and ethnic): we are taking data from quantitative research at face value and we are not always aware that the “raw” data are in fact products of manipulation, and suffer multiple operations of human decisions and cosmetic assistance.

The objectification of the Roma category was also facilitated by the fact that surveyors are almost always going in the same localities, so the so-called random samples lost their randomness. Not only that some localities became the “preferred” places for Roma-related data gathering, but also at the regional level there are some countries from Central and Eastern Europe that are considered as key places for the professional polling agencies in drawing information and inferences about Roma in Europe. In addition, mass media gives easy clues for recognition and self-recognition of Roma by producing and promoting various cultural items with a huge stereotypical background.

Moreover, not just the researchers and field operators adopt categories of political practice as categories of analysis,¹³ but the subjects themselves are prone to adopt the language of the day. A survey conducted today asking about self-ascription is an even less reflexive exercise than it was in the 1990s, both for the researchers and for the subjects. The category of Roma has been objectified and internalized, and the questions and answers related to the ethnicity are given more quickly and almost unproblematically nowadays.

Of equal importance to following up on the construction of Roma as an object of study by their academic-expert spokespersons, is to inquire about the representation of those labeled as Gypsies/Roma, and to find out whether the Gypsy/Roma self-image is affected by the internalization of scientifically produced stereotypes. When choosing a research population, most studies about Roma take into consider-

¹³ For the distinction between categories of analysis and categories of practice, see Brubaker (2004).

ation the self-ascription as Roma as valid knowledge, and discard or ignore the fact that self-identification is forced by the artificial research situation, which functions as a context of knowledge production. People self-labeling as Roma in censuses or in surveys form, at least in theory, a solid and realistic basis from which researchers select subjects for further inquiry. However, the interpretation of social scientists on self-ascription is ambivalent: when convenient for validating pre-determined research categories, scientists consider self-ascription as a good starting point in their construction of Gypsy/Roma population, but when self-ascription does not fit with their population model or with pre-determined expectations, scientists claim a false consciousness for those who do not self-identify as Roma. At the beginning of the 1990s, much quantitative research on Roma in CEE was made by hetero-identification (ethnic identity attributed by interview operator or even by neighbors). At least at the conceptual level, both methods of identification of members of a Roma population—that are based on hetero- and self-identification—are still in use. People's knowledge about their affiliations to different social groups is a result of a process of incorporating information, which comes from the outside world. In the case of the Gypsy/Roma group, sociologists demonstrated that hetero-identification does not map into self-ascription (see Ladányi and Szelényi 2001). Many of the stereotypes created by the out-group are self-internalized and reproduced by Roma themselves and sometimes the negative representations are a by-product of activists and scholarly work (e.g., Kligman 2001). Our considerations about others and about ourselves are guided and manipulated by the cultural apparatus of the dominant elite, in which the academic establishment (beyond media) is a significant part. People are responsive to politically crafted categories, which is revealed by the fact that when they are compelled to “self-identify” as *Gypsies* in censuses or sociological surveys, they do so, but the same happens when they are influenced to register as *Roma*. The change of census category from *Gypsy* to *Roma* in early 1990s (in the Romanian census, but also elsewhere in Central and Eastern Europe) produces a reorientation in people's answers: some of those who previously defined themselves as Gypsies now self-identify as Roma. The fact that people comply with requests of categorization in censuses or in surveys indicates that self-identification cannot be regarded as merely an autonomous matter of personal option or belief.

The Roma category is a recent political construction, which has been predominantly developed by political (Roma and non-Roma) entrepreneurs, and has been imposed on public opinion in the last two decades. Yet, academics were also important contributors to this political construction. Our personal sorting (or accepting to be sorted) in a group is highly influenced by the significant actors, and if in the future the Roma category will be re-labeled by political, academic, or educational apparatuses in any other abstract category, considering the precedent, it is likely that people will obey it.

It is not merely about human cognition and our simplified way of judging (scientists included), which inherently produce biases, but it is also about the compelling force of the cultural apparatus and its hegemony. Mills explains how people acquire knowledge and self-knowledge through the assimilation of mediated representations and stereotypes that are created and spread by completely unknown people unrelated to them:

But in their everyday life they do not experience a world of solid fact; their experience itself is selected by stereotyped meanings and shaped by ready-made interpretations. Their images of the world, and of themselves, are given to them by crowds of witnesses they have never met and shall never meet. Yet for every man these images—provided by strangers and dead men—are the very basis of his life as a human being. (1963, 405)

The foreign origin of Roma, initially Egyptian and afterwards Indian, is an example of knowledge about self that people labeled as such gradually acquired from experts and scientists, rather than from their circles of relatives. Moreover, this externally produced knowledge does not influence just the way in which people perceive themselves, but also the way in which they live their lives. I have been visiting many schools in Central and Eastern Europe in which Roma pupils are separated in distinct school facilities, or in which they are “integrated”¹⁴ with non-Roma pupils. What I observed is that in both cases of school facili-

¹⁴ In fact, in many of these so-called integrated schools Roma are learning in separate classes.

ties, separated or integrated, where there is a significant body of Roma pupils there is often an “Indian corner” depicting India as an exotic place, in which Roma culture has its roots. Curiously, there was no such Indian corner in schools before 1990. To complete the picture, always when delegations of visitors (experts or politicians) arrive to learn about the Roma realities on the ground, schools feel obliged to arrange a small show of Roma dancing and singing, and these shows are carefully prepared so as to appear close to Indian culture. This way children learn about their Indian origins, and they share their knowledge acquired from school with their families, so Roma parents also learn about the relatedness of their culture with that of India. Given the changes in school curriculum made by experts, people learn and reproduce information about themselves; afterwards, knowledge appears to be seen as pertaining to people from Roma communities instead of experts producing it. Of course, the cultural construction of an imagined community (Anderson [1983] 2006) by an intellectual elite does not apply merely to Roma, but also to all cultures that passed through a standardization process. In the construction of a unitary Roma culture those who contribute to standardization are not merely non-Roma, but many of them come from the outside of communities they describe.

In the same vein of a cultural apparatus that teaches people who they are, interactions with significant actors from outside the family circle play an important role in the configuration of personal identity and in the apprehension of the social world. Society, by its dynamic and dialectic processes, is inevitably conducive to the reification¹⁵ of what is to be known, and the products of knowledge come into our view as a discovery of reality and not as an invention in the process of conceptualization and naming. People become accustomed to nat-

¹⁵ The concept of reification is defined by Berger and Luckman as “... the apprehension of the products of human activity as if they were something other than human products—such as facts of nature, results of cosmic laws, or manifestations of divine will. Reification implies that man is capable of forgetting his own authorship of the human world, and, further, that the dialectic between man, the producer, and his products is lost to consciousness” (1966, 106). Gould conceives reification as a type of fallacy: “*Reification*, or our tendency to convert abstract concepts into entities (from the Latin *res*, or thing)” (1996, 56).

urally operating with categories that were instituted through negotiations, which later on are forgotten and appear as natural to them, inevitably and independently of the human will (Berger and Luckman 1966).

In fixing an ethnic reference, beyond the parental influence in the primary socialization, there is a series of instances, which intervene into the adult life of an individual. School, mass media, political system, university, academic community, etc. (by their produced objects, such as teaching, speeches, university courses, research reports, etc.) are pertinent social agents that strengthen or, on the contrary, subvert the understanding of ethnic identity inculcated in early socialization. This ethnic identity is instilled even due to the mere fact that someone speaks a language or lives in a certain geographical or residential area. Although language appears as a natural entity, in fact its standardization, codification and, transmission into a linguistic community is regulated through state institutions (among which the school system is one of a prime importance), in order to create the sense of shared ethnicity among socially diverse people (Balibar 1996). Agents who have the capacity to produce and disseminate public discourse have the function of maintenance and preservation or alteration of the ethnic conception, which is transmitted in early socialization. In the words of Berger and Luckman, "The most important vehicle of reality-maintenance is conversation" (1966, 172). Conversation is not merely or primarily an act of direct face-to-face relation with others, but also a process of thought in relation to a *generalized other*, who is omnipresent in our mind as an interlocutor (Mills 1963). Therefore, in the process of thinking, conversations with ourselves are in fact instances of letting our own thoughts to be judged and often censored by society, which is incorporated in the consciousness. Self-ascription to the Roma category does not make an exception from the way the society is mind-incorporated, being therefore a judgment impinged on individuals by the society through its various channels, including self-reflection.

The basic conflict in research about Roma is not only that the *Roma* category appears as a natural, obvious, self-evident kind of entity for scientists and policymakers, but that they are using this category in opposition to an even more obscure and abstract one, that of *non-Roma*. If it seems to be difficult to answer the question "Who are the

Roma?”, it is even more complicated to define who the non-Roma are, as they are built in contradistinction to an elusive and fluctuating socially constructed entity.

The self-ascription as Gypsies/Roma should not be considered an *a priori* knowledge basis for sociological research, and for scientific research in general, especially nowadays after many years of imposing a “self-ascription” as Roma. I do not affirm that Roma people do not exist, but I assert that Roma population exists as a negative and oppositional construction made by dominant groups and self-internalized by many of those labeled as Roma. In his paper entitled “Making up People,” Hacking (1986) argues that all people are made up from descriptions that come under a label and that are also important prescriptive and normative stimuli, restraining the possibilities of manifestations of persons so categorized and making them act in the direction of the expert prescriptions. In “making up people,” the imposition of categorization from above meets the agency¹⁶ of individuals from below:

I do not believe there is a general story to be told about making up people. Each category has its own history. If we wish to present a partial framework in which to describe such events, we might think of two vectors. One is the vector of labeling from above, from a community of experts who create a ‘reality’ that some people make their own. Different from this is the vector of the autonomous behavior of the person so labeled, which presses from below, creating a reality every expert must face. (Hacking 1986, 168)

Surveys that ask respondents to disclose their ethnic identity are producing ethnic classifications that are not independent, but rather interacting with those who are so classified in a normative sense, prescribing them modes of thinking and acting. The various classifications and categorizations are in most cases reactive, i.e., people are interacting with the classifications, which are being proposed to them. The classifiers interact with those who are classified through the categories embedded

¹⁶ Agency as a sociological concept is the capacity of people to make their own choices beyond and independently of social structures, which constrain and impose rules of conduct and behavior.

in the work of classification. Those who are classified could either reject/modify the classifications applied to them, or, on the contrary, accept the classifications, depending on how persuasive or intrusive are the producer of classification and/or those who circulate it. Using the example of autism and schizophrenia, Hacking (1999) shows how the social constructs are born in the field of psychiatry, and how these classificatory labels interact with those so classified. For example, a person with (high functional) autism understands being sorted in this particular way, even if he/she cannot communicate this understanding. While some classifications could have an emancipatory and liberating side (e.g., when the classification allows free adhesion to a group), there is also an abusive side to it, due to the intrusion into someone's private life. Ethnic classification makes no exception in being abusive in some cases.

The fact that ascriptions under a description fit the generalized and common expectations for typification as well as the individual aspirations for self-construction closes this way the loop of expert and scientific classifications. Apparently, those classified and labeled cannot have an exit choice from an identity frame defined by authority. Both internalization and rejection of the ethnic label are part of the same game of power, aiming to produce an identity and social recognition (Jenkins 1996). However, beyond attitudes of acceptance or rejection of an ethnic label, in everyday life there are probably a number of cases in which ethnic labeling is to a high extent irrelevant: individuals who are labeled and assigned an ethnic category could be indifferent to labeling, neither accepting it, nor rejecting it.

Chapter 2

Ethnicity Theories and Research Practices

This chapter aims to prepare the ground for an analysis of the Roma-related literature by situating it in the context of debates regarding the concept of ethnicity and its uses in the social sciences. To do so, I will map the main theories about ethnicity and point out how connected or disconnected these theories are with research practices from the domain of quantitative research. Bringing to attention theories about ethnicity and confronting them with practices from quantitative Roma-related research, I suggest that the latter strand of research holds no solid ground to proceed with an investigation of Roma ethnicity. Most often, quantitative research about Roma (which is primarily policy research) closes a possible investigation of Roma ethnicity by assuming a taken for granted perspective based on common sense. The quantitative literature on Roma within social sciences (but also in human population genetics) seems to be uninformed about social theories that regard ethnicity as a category constructed through research practices and political endeavors. On the contrary, it seems that a large body of quantitative research on Roma (and sometime of qualitative research as well) takes Roma ethnicity for granted and proceeds to an investigation of it from the assumption that Roma ethnic identity (as well as any other ethnic identity) is a matter of fact, and not of developing and changing subjective beliefs. In short, I consider that current empirical research on Roma in which ethnicity is taken for granted prevails over empirical research backed by social theories of ethnicity. Scrutiny of

Roma-related research literature in the next chapters illustrates this fragmentation between research practice and social theory, and points out one of the main tensions subtending the field of social sciences. In discussing and contrasting theories of ethnicity with research practices employed in quantitative research on Roma, the aim of this chapter is twofold: on the one hand, to make the case that Roma conceptualization in quantitative surveys is to a large extent uninformed by theory, and on the other hand to add a case to the thesis of the social construction of ethnic identity by pointing out the pitfalls of quantitative surveys on Roma.

1. CONSTRUCTIVIST THEORIES VS. ESSENTIALIST PRACTICES

In countries of Central and South East Europe the word ethnicity is rather infrequent in common language (see Ahmed, Feliciano, and Emigh 2007), and it was rarely used until recently as a word in everyday language. Instead, ethnicity was and continues to be a word frequently used in expert discourse of the academic community, in mass media, and in political speech. The fact that ethnicity is hardly used in everyday language does not imply that people do not think in categories about differences existing among them. Based on common perception, people do sort in categories; in doing so, they classify in “we” and “they,” but attaching ethnic labels to “we” and “they” arrives as a matter of learning. In common perception some differences among people gain prominence, while some others get lost. Numerous social psychology experiments demonstrate that the categorization process is accompanied by the distortion of perception that manifests itself either in diminishing differences among categories (assimilation), or in amplifying these differences (contrast).¹

In research approaches to ethnicity, some researchers infer their research interest from (ethnic) categorization; other researchers start from how people judge human diversity and make use of everyday categories, which form their basic research assumptions. In most of the

¹ See Plous (2003) for a series of such experiments.

empirical research, there is a taken-for-granted usage of the ethnicity concept that gives it a fixed, immutable connotation, although there is a growing critical social theory perspective, which, on the contrary, purports to demonstrate that ethnicity is a continuous process of negotiation and exchange of meanings in a social game of power. In agreement with other authors,² I consider that the quantitative approach in sociology, which is uninformed by theory, fails to provide explanations of social phenomenon and to adequately capture their social construction. Moreover, the overreliance on quantitative measures to capture social realities limits sociological imagination, with consequences preserving the status quo. Empirical quantitative sociology works most often within a functionalist paradigm, being subservient to political power and to the maintenance of the existing social order (including the classification order), while social theory is rather seeking social change, being critical of the current social order of classification. I subscribe to the criticism of Mills ([1959] 2000) in relation to sociological traditions of “grand theory” and of “abstracted empiricism” that both contribute to the reification of social relations supposed to be investigated. In Mills’ terms, “abstracted empiricism” is the quantitative sociological craft put to work for the bureaucratic-political establishment. My claim is that policy research and official statistics on Roma as “abstracted empiricism” use the concept of ethnicity in the taken-for-granted mode in the administrative practice of census-taking, but also in social studies and surveys, and this way research practices con-

² The problematic use of quantitative data in sociological research manifests itself both in regard to official statistics and numbers produced by sociological techniques of sampling used in surveys (or by estimates). For a discussion of uncritical usage of official statistics in sociological research see, for example, Kitsuse and Cicourel (1963), who argue that statistics of deviance are produced by governmental bodies, which decide to circumscribe certain behaviors as deviant while excluding others. For the artificiality of survey’s standardized interviews and their inability to capture the meaning invested by research subjects, see Cicourel (1982). For quantitative methods in social sciences as rhetorical instruments for sociological approaches sustaining the status quo, see Agger (1991). For a criticism of “epistemocratic vision” based on the use of quantitative data decoupled of social theory, see Bourdieu (1988).

tribute to the reification of Roma identity instead of leaving it open for self-determination and analysis.

In what follows, I will make a brief overview of the status of the concept of ethnicity within the social sciences, as it is important to place Roma-related literature and the administrative practice of censuses recording ethnicity in context. As such, by revisiting the main landmarks of theories of ethnicity, I propose to discern whether Roma-related literature that discusses Roma ethnicity is connected or not to social theory. In the first part of this chapter, I focus on theories of ethnicity and their relevance to the Roma case. In the second part of the chapter, I analyze the way in which “abstracted empiricism” or Roma-related policy based on quantitative surveys construct a research object that is enclosed within its own methodological limits. In this regard, I discuss the unrepresentativeness of the supposedly representative Roma samples, the artificiality and intrusiveness of field practices of interviewing in Roma surveys, and the way in which framing questions leads to pre-established answers.

Ethnicity as a fiction made by science

Since the 1970s, theoretical controversies about ethnicity have begun to settle in the social sciences. The social constructivist line of argumentation became largely accepted: ethnic groups are not natural or substantial givens, but socially constructed entities. Constructivists argue that ethnicity is contextual, situational, performative, and fluid, opposing essentialism that contends that ethnicity is objective, stable, and independent of socio-political and economic contexts. Since the debate about the ethnicity concept has been settled for social theory, I will not reflect on the theoretical debates and controversies around the concept, but rather the mainstream sociological perspectives that regard ethnicity as a social construct, in order to contrast them with current sociological practice. What I see as a controversy today is not that among social theories, but between social theory and quantitative sociology. Nevertheless, I acknowledge the oversimplification and the risks of adopting such a trenchant position among theorists and practitioners, as some social theorists have remarkable contributions to the empirical research, and some sociologists interested in quantitative research contributed to enriching and validating social theory.

The distinction that I draw between a *constructivist social theory* and an *essentialist sociological practice* is to a certain extent scholastic, but useful for understanding the tensions subtending the sociological field. These two branches of social science too often have different and divorced views in regard to the concept of ethnicity: while for social theory ethnicity is a social construct, for quantitative sociology ethnicity is an objective (and measurable) reality.

This distinction should not be generalized as there are convincing empirical analyses of data that rely on a constructivist perspective to demonstrate the lack of reliability of quantitative research about Roma.³ However, such empirical demonstrations of statistical artifacts of ethnic data (in our case, Roma-related data) are rather rare and lacking followers. But there is an abundance of empirical research⁴ that strives to measure Roma ethnicity as an independent variable and to put it in relation to a wide range of phenomena such as poverty, welfare dependency, illiteracy, unemployment, substandard housing, intelligence, and so on. To sum up, it is rather the social theorists who regard ethnicity (and Roma ethnicity) as a social construct, and the applied sociologists who regard it (with few but notable exceptions) as a quantifiable reality.

Among social theorists, the mainstream view is that ethnicity is a concept, and therefore it is an intellectual construction of the researcher who uses it, and not an objective reality decoupled and independent from the mind that constructed it (e.g., Anderson [1983] 2006; Brubaker 2004). Ethnicity as a concept was rediscovered by the modern social sciences in order to replace the discredited concept of race, which dominated academic discourse in the nineteenth and in the first half of the twentieth century. Attempts to formally discard the concept of race from academic use could be traced to the UNESCO declarations,⁵ which are documents drafted by leading scholars in

³ An example of such quantitative research is that of Ladányi and Szelényi (2001), in which Roma ethnicity appears as a dependent variable.

⁴ A few examples of such studies are analyzed in Chapter 6. The way in which Roma ethnicity is codified in censuses is analyzed in Chapter 4.

⁵ The initial declaration from 1950 was revised in 1951, and afterwards in 1967 and 1978.

sociology, psychology, biology, cultural anthropology, and ethnology. These attempts to discredit race as a valid conceptual term were followed by its replacement with the concept of population (and ethnic groups). This change was rather slow, and both terms were used interchangeably by some scholars for a long period of time; some use them so even today.⁶

An important difference between social theory and applied sociology is that while the former remains confined to a rather small public of specialists, the latter, which provides information for policy research, has a larger audience, and, consequently, it is more powerful in influencing how people think and act. On the one hand, social theory deconstructs the view of ethnicity as a fixed and given reality, but fails to reach a large public. On the other hand, applied sociology, largely disseminated by mass media, becomes a major contributor to the particular case of social construction of (Roma) ethnicity. It could be said that sociology is more efficient in shaping a societal understanding of ethnicity as an objective reality (through censuses, quantitative surveys, and opinion polls) than in advancing a constructivist point of view about ethnicity for public understanding. This is somehow unsurprising as far as censuses, opinion polls, and surveys attach ethnic labels to the general and vague knowledge of difference among people, this way stabilizing categorical thinking through an abundant production and circulation of ethnic data (or ethno-statistics). By disseminating ethnic surveys and poll findings, initially a vague and unstructured social knowledge of human diversity becomes structured, meaningful, and seemingly and suddenly objective. Through repeated operations of import-export (to and from the public discourse) made by research design and dissemination of ethnic research outcomes, the concept of ethnicity (re)invented by scholars in order to replace that of race became part of everyday discourse. Social scientists take the unstructured categories of difference among people from the repertoire of common knowledge, and return it to society via the ethnicity concept, which is objectified through scientific means. In other words, social scientists take a stereotyped modality of thinking in

⁶ See Bourdieu (1991) for the replacement of race with ethnicity in the social sciences, and Gannett (2001) and Lipphardt (2012) for the replacement of race with population in genetics.

categories from people, through which they operate in everyday interactions, and return these categories as scientific, objective truth.⁷ In Chapter 6, I illustrate a case study about how public opinion is manipulated by framing (closed) questions, and also used to disseminate the image of Roma as a welfare dependent group. An image of Roma as a welfare dependent group is claimed even despite data not sustaining such a claim. Moreover, Roma are selectively confined to the welfare dependent category so as to appear as a prototype of this category, although primary beneficiaries of state resources (in terms of number and amount of benefits) should be looked for more broadly and in all societal layers.

In everyday life, social space is ordered through operations of classification, so that a previously unfamiliar social space becomes mapped or populated with ethnicities. In terms of ethnic labels, regardless of what an individual may think, in routine classificatory practices, the ethnic frames through which a person is seen by others are more important than self-perception. As Jenkins put it, “Whether the ethnic identification is ‘correct’ or not—in your eyes—may make no difference. Identity is often in the eye of the beholder” (1996, 2). When the number of these “others” who are (or are perceived as) authority framers is high, or when they are significantly powerful, ethnicity comes to be defined mainly by these “others,” and the way in which an individual may think about himself could even be changed under the influence of the classifiers. As I demonstrate in Chapter 4, which analyzes the last census data from Romania, the ethnic category of Roma is attributed also to people who do not consider themselves as such. Census makers put different and sometimes divergent categories under the umbrella category of Roma. As the case study shows, it seems that alongside the history of administrative records in Romania, the external identification of Roma played an important role since the beginning of population counting practices. Moreover, as I show in the next chapter, the identification work carried out by the police proved to interfere with the way in which Roma were framed throughout history by state institutions.

⁷ The idea of cultural circularity appears also in Burke (2013, 96–99) in relation to exchanges between foreign cultures or between academic and popular cultures.

Social scientists are not neutral examiners of ethnicity, but through the analyses they perform in various scientific practices, and especially through quantitative research, they impose ethnicity as a common category of thinking and seeing, and contribute to instilling a general perception of ethnicity. The permeation of social sciences discourse about ethnicity in everyday language is due to the wide dissemination of scientific knowledge through mass media and to the political applications of ethnic statistics (e.g., affirmative action in politics and in education). As a result, social sciences have become more and more accessible to the large public who gain easy access to scientific products, concepts, and ways of validating scientific discourse (e.g., how large a good sample should be, how well the questions are framed in a questionnaire, whether data interpretation is pertinent, etc.). Therefore, through the naturalization of ethnicity, scholars from different branches contribute to strengthening a worldview with a great potential for social division.

Before acquiring its status as an accepted social convention, ethnicity appears as a fictitious object. I use the words fiction or fictitious with the meaning acknowledged by Geertz in his book, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, for speaking about anthropological texts as being interpretations of the second or third order: "... fictions, in the sense that they are 'something made,' 'something fashioned'—the original meaning of *fictiō*—not that they are false, unfactual, or merely 'as if' thought experiments" (1973, 15). The fictional character of ethnicity is revealed by the fact that ethnicity is far from being ahistorical, as often presented. "Fictive ethnicity" refers to a process of manufacturing and institutionalization of ethnicity by the nation states that make it appear as natural:

No nation possesses an ethnic base naturally, but as social formations are nationalized, the populations included within them, divided up among them or dominated by them are ethnicized—that is, represented in the past or in the future *as if* they formed a natural community, possessing of itself an identity of origins, culture and interests which transcends individuals and social social conditions. (Balibar 1996, 164)

In this context, it is important to note that Roma were not an ethnic group in the Middle Ages and particularly before the emergence of

nation states in the nineteenth century—nation states being built on stressing a national identity in opposition to undesired groups that have been minoritized and denationalized. The ethnicity of a group is historically built (as opposed to being given) through a process of claiming descent from another community (existing *prior* to the nation state), to which the current one stands in a relation of continuity. *Regressus ad infinitum*, in the filiation of descent it could be discovered that there are no further grounds on which to base ethnicity as a narrative of difference, other than shared community. While the notion of ethnicity is originally a fiction, at the same time it is constitutive of social reality due to the fact that it is a shared fiction.

The entrepreneurial side of ethnicity

Classic sociology does not give ethnicity an important place in the works of its founders. The only classical, explicit reference to ethnicity is made by Max Weber,⁸ who devoted rather marginal space to it in his work compared to the attention given to economic and religious aspects in the organization of society. In regard to ethnicity, Weber could be considered a constructivist *avant la lettre*. However, scholars sometimes reproach him that while acknowledging ethnicity as a social construct, Weber does not deny the existence of objective, ethnic collectivities based on shared ancestry or on ethnic origin, and in a few places he subscribes to it (see Banton 2007). It is perhaps not surprising that those social theorists who are closer to a primordialist understanding of ethnicity claim that Weber is a supporter of this approach exactly by quoting him on linkages between ethnicity and descent, despite the whole spirit and logic of his text that points to an opposite understanding. For Weber ([1922] 1978), ethnicity is an important issue only insofar as it results from and drives social action; otherwise, in sociological analyses ethnicity is a term which is superfluous, and any rigorous analysis should rather dispense of it. The arti-

⁸ Weber theorizes ethnicity in his major work, *Economy and Society*, from 1922. I cite from the English 1978 translation. In this edition, the chapter referring to ethnicity was translated to English as “ethnic groups,” but a more appropriate translation would have been, according to Banton (2007), that of “ethnic communities.”

ficial character of ethnicity and its social construction is summarized by Weber as such: "... ethnic membership does not constitute a group; it only facilitates group formation of any kind, particularly in the political sphere. On the other hand, it is primarily the political community no matter how artificially organized that inspires the belief in common ethnicity" ([1922] 1978, 389). Ethnicity is primarily a political phenomenon of mass mobilization by the political entrepreneurs in search of symbolic and material resources for themselves and their supporters (Weber [1922] 1978). Since Weber, all the major sociological debates were focused around ethnicity construction as a political phenomenon, which inspires modern sociological investigations to search for political actors that substantially contribute to its construction. A fully constructed ethnic group exists only insofar as the political actors are successful in mass mobilization around the idea of a shared ethnicity. The constitutive elements of different ethnicities are not the essential traits of people, but quite the opposite, the small elements in customs and in lifestyles are the markers of ethnicity. Those small elements are given prominence and are heightened and strengthened by conscious political actors, rather than by those who are supposed to be members of the ethnic group. In the absence of political entrepreneurs to observe, brand, and reinforce the small differences in customs and lifestyles, they could easily pass unnoticed. These tiny differences in everyday habits or in terms of clothing, for example, are constituted as ethnic boundaries through political action and discourse. The existence of an ethnic group is indissolubly related to the existence of a political community, either a current one or a past political organization, which left at least shared memories of it. The importance of a political community in inspiring the belief in a shared ethnicity appears more obvious with the emergence and growing of Roma civil society organizations and political parties after the 1990s, and with the very active implication of these organizations in Roma identity campaigns (in censuses and beyond) via all means of mass communication. In addition, the work of these organizations and of scholars of Romani origin in acknowledging the ethnic mobilization since the interwar period serve to tie Roma ethnicity to past attempts at political organization.

Whatever seemingly physical objective traits members of society may share, for an ethnic group to become from a latent potentiality a reality, there is a need for a purposefully oriented political entre-

preneurship. This political entrepreneurship is directed, on the one hand, at reviving shared memories and myths of origins among the masses, and, on the other hand, at offering economic dividends to the group of political entrepreneurs and their political clientele. For the masses sought to be represented, the only benefit from ethnic membership appurtenance is, as Weber suggests, an illusory participation in a group of prestige, as for example poor white people sharing the belief of a noble descent by comparison with that of the African slaves: “the social honor of the ‘poor whites’ was dependent upon the social *declassement* of the Negroes” ([1922] 1978, 391). The ethnicity concept as developed by Weber could be abridged in three main ideas: ethnicity is a social construct; it is a group-product; and its manufacture brings privileges for the producers.⁹

In the case of Gypsies/Roma, the revival of the origin myth related to their supposed Indian origin is invigorated not only by political actors, but also and foremost by representatives of the academic community, experts, and policymakers. This reinforcement of myths of origin obscures the fact that it is a matter of speculation to assign a single (Indian, Egyptian, or whatever else) origin to such a large group of people, labeled as Gypsies or Roma (although some of them reject both labels). Despite many Roma having neither the memories of an Indian homeland, nor considering relevant the scrutiny of their possible origin in a distant Indian past (Okely 1983; Stewart 1997; Gay y Blasco 2001), the supposed Indian origin is presented in many academic and policy papers as a fact and consequently not as a theory. Ethnicity formation in the case of Roma is not primarily driven by a Roma political community, but by external academic, expert, and political communities.

⁹ In Banton’s words: “*Ethnische Gemeinschaften* [ethnic community] advanced three positive arguments. The first was that an ethnic group was *künstlich* (in contemporary parlance, a social construct) because it was based on a belief in shared *Gemeinschaft* [community]. Second, the belief in shared *Gemeinschaft* [community] did not create the group; the group created the belief. Third, group formation resulted from the drive to monopolise power and status. Humans wanted economic and social privileges for themselves and their allies” (2007, 23).

Ethnicity as an artificial boundary

The absence of debates around ethnicity from other major classical works of sociology is due to the fact that other, more important forces than ethnicity were believed to play a role in the rapid modernization of Western societies in the twentieth century, such as status, position, and social class. Classical sociologists considered the concept of ethnicity rather a remnant of traditional, archaic societies, describing realities that are no longer applicable to the profound societal dynamics entailed by a cosmopolitan and global capitalist society. In this regard, the term ethnicity was expelled to anthropology and ethnology, whose object of study were “primitive” societies, to be found in the colonies of the Western European imperial powers. As Banton (2007) acknowledges, the current discussion about ethnicity did not depart too much from the initial questions and perspectives brought by Weber.

The theoretical frame of ethnicity suggested by Weber was developed later on in the works of critical sociologists¹⁰ who adopted a social constructivist position (as Weber himself did). If Weber considered ethnicity as a political construction, Barth (1969) complements this view, significantly adding that ethnicity is a phenomenon of boundary and of continuous negotiation of it. Barth was interested in the “boundary maintenance” through which social groups who detain power in various degrees are trying to differentiate themselves through education, skills, occupation, etc. Barth’s boundary maintenance concept resonates with the earlier concept of status group closure that Weber used for comparing monopolist tendencies in ethno-political and economic entrepreneurship. However, if the Weberian theory of ethnicity suggests researching political actions in order to understand ethnicity construction, Barth proposes a critical inquiry into how culture is codified and enclosed in a cultural essentialism. In his approach, it is the “ethnic boundary that defines the group, not the cultural stuff that it encloses” (1969, 15), and ethnic boundaries are rather social, geographical, and environmental than cultural. Within

¹⁰ There are many constructivist accounts of ethnicity. I mention here a few that I consider influential, and to which I subscribe: Barth (1969), Bourdieu (1991), Balibar (1996), Jenkins (1997), Bourdieu and Wacquant (1999), Brubacker (2004), Banton (2007).

the same ethnic group, different cultures might be distinguished as a result of political and economic circumstances. Moreover, culture is not a static and unchanging object, ready to be evaluated, but it is dynamically constructed in everyday interactions among members of different ethnic groups; it changes in time and space under the influence of social factors and under the constraints of various “ecological niches” (ibid., 19).

There are probably more individuals to be found on the border or between borders than those that can fully be considered to be members of an ethnic group: “What is surprising is not the existence of some actors that fall between these categories, and of some regions in the world where all persons do not tend to sort themselves out in this way, but the fact that variations tend to cluster at all” (Barth 1969, 29). Cases of individuals crossing ethnic boundaries are more frequent than cases of those remaining within borders. Processes of group inclusion and exclusion assigned to ethnicity could be territorial, cultural, or based on “value standards.” Barth (1969) mentions “pariah groups” as being a specific type of ethnicity construction and he includes Gypsies in this category. Minorities (and pariah groups are always in a minority position) have a construction of ethnicity, which takes place “within the framework of the dominant, majority group’s statuses and institutions” (ibid., 31). What is noteworthy in Barth’s perspective is that the border is not fixed but continuous,¹¹ and there is always an open relationship between groups which aim to self-establish and other well-established groups which should offer recognition to the former.

To sum up, ethnicity is dependent on situations, social relationships, and circumstances that exist in the local contexts where meaning and signification are created and negotiated. Beyond the context, ethnicity loses its meaning and fails to provide a more general frame for assessing the existing social organization. However, occasions and pretexts for ethnic framing could be artificially created and maintained by political actors in the pursuit of political objectives.

Ethnicity discourse contributes to the formation and consolidation of nation states, for which the ethnic border is juxtaposed with

¹¹ The same idea appears in Jenkins (1996), who underlines the permeability of the ethnic boundaries.

the territorial demarcation; in time, however, it acquired the function of maintaining social distance among individuals and groups, even inside the same geographical, political, and (in the case of large segments of Roma) linguistic border. Gypsies/Roma are marked as ethnically different even when they are members of the same linguistic group with the majority, and, moreover, even when they only speak the majority language and no other languages. As censuses record, the proportion of those labeled as Roma is far greater than the number of Romani language speakers (see also Kovats 2002), and currently there are more people labeled as Roma who in fact speak the language of the majority in their countries. In the nineteenth century, at least for administrative statistical purposes, in the very concept of ethnicity demographers set out the mother tongue or the spoken language as a criterion for nationality (Labbé 2009a). Although the language was meant to denote allegiances to a specific culture and ethnicity, in the case of Gypsies/Roma linguistic affiliation of those so categorized did not count too much, neither in censuses of that time, nor of the present day. The fact that many of the Roma selected in censuses and sociological surveys speak the language of the majority and not the Romani language was not impeding their clear-cut classification as a Roma ethnicity.

Ethnicity as an uncritical circulated category

Perhaps the sharpest analysis of ethnicity is made by Pierre Bourdieu; although he is occasionally referring directly to the concept, Bourdieu is very trenchant in highlighting the political character of ethnicity. In Bourdieu's conceptualization, ethnic identity (and in a broader sense regional identities) is the result of an operation of "social magic" (1991, 223) through which the powerful producers of ethnic classifications and descriptions impose their vision to those so classified, described, named, and labeled; by this successful imposition, they constitute an "objective" reality. The power that classifiers have is the power of naming. Those who have more power can compel more easily their order of classification and definition, and by virtue of their recognized authority they give meanings to social realities. The imposition of subjective beliefs as objective realities is the result of a process of domination from one side and submission from the other side:

Struggles over ethnic or regional identity... are a particular case of the different struggles over classifications, struggles over the monopoly of the power to make people see and believe, to get them to know and recognize, to impose the legitimate definition of the divisions of the social world and, thereby, to make and unmake groups. What is at stake here is the power of imposing a vision of the social world through principles of di-vision which, when they are imposed on a whole group, establishing meaning and a consensus about meaning, and in particular about the identity and unity of the group, which creates the reality of the unity and the identity of the group. (Bourdieu 1991, 221)

The criticism of ethnicity as developed by Bourdieu is very relevant for the case of Roma ethnicity formation. Bourdieu's views are appropriate, as all the elements that apply to ethnicity formation are present in the case of Roma: first, the position of authority of classifiers as either scientific or political (e.g., Council of Europe, European Commission, World Bank); second, the familiarity of the representations of Roma produced by these actors; and third, the successful ethnic mobilization as a result of persuasion by political leaders to convince people to self-identify as Roma in various contexts (including censuses).

According to Bourdieu (1991), the identity of a collectivity is impinged on the public conscience from the position of authority of a classifier considered legitimate, and, at the same time, legitimacy is established by assuring the adequacy of ethnic (and regional) identities for public expectations. In the process of attributing identities, a central role is assumed by the "spokesperson" as the main agent of ethnicity construction. The knowledge effect—that is cognition and recognition of a category—does not depend solely on the authority of the person who publicly performs the categorization, but also on the recognition of seemingly objective traits by those categorized in the discourse of the categorizer. Therefore, in order for a knowledge effect to be achieved, there is a need for a double recognition: on the one hand, an acknowledgement of the institution's authority as an institution entitled to perform discourse about ethnicity and to produce ethnic categories, and, on the other hand, a recognition of those so categorized in the proposed definitions, due to economic, cultural, or another "natural" objective situation that is shared by the members

of the group (Bourdieu 1991). In other words, the symbolic power of language and the legitimacy of the classifier act in conjunction in producing largely shared beliefs: "What creates the power of words and slogans, a power capable of maintaining or subverting the social order, is the belief in the legitimacy of the words and of those who utter them. And words alone cannot create this belief" (*ibid.*, 170).

A further criticism of ethnicity as a sociological construct imposed by rulers to those ruled is made by Bourdieu and Waquant (1999, 2001): the ethnicity concept and its related notions such as identity, minority, community, or multiculturalism have been legitimated in the scientific field by the academic and expert discourse originating in the United States (US). According to these authors, the concept of ethnicity was "exported" by American scholars to Brazil and Europe through scholarly or amateur studies, journalism, and, importantly, political discourse. Global adoption of the ethnicity concept is the result of transposing "the US folk-concept of 'race'" (Bourdieu and Waquant 1999, 48), understood as descent or ancestry, into the current ethnicity concept, as it is acknowledged and used by the academic, journalistic and political circles in Europe. Bourdieu and Waquant (1999, 2001) acknowledge that together with this import of the concept of ethnicity from the American model, all socially constructed problems deriving from the exclusivism of racial categories were brought to Europe¹² and other parts of the world. The uncritical adoption of the American frames of ethnic (racial) thought into the social sciences in Europe transfers the racialization and polarization of human differences in terms of ethnicity and ethnicization, obscuring therefore the more powerful social cleavages expressed in terms of economic domination. This way, the debate around social and economic inequality moves to the ethnic field. The exclusivism of ethnic and racial classifications in the US administrative census, legal practices, and scholarly debate

¹² Yet the thesis of Bourdieu and Waquant about the import of ethnicity concept from US to Europe has to be problematized as it seems to apply rather to countries of Central and Eastern Europe and may not be appropriate for the whole of Western Europe, as the accent in the former region was put more on ethnic divisions, while in countries such as France or Germany a citizenship model that disregards ethno-cultural allegiances is dominant.

impinges upon a mimesis of the “academic schemata” into European scholarly and, especially, amateur production, as part of a globalization process (Bourdieu and Waquant 1999). Ethnicity has been pervading common language via journalistic, political, and scientific discourse.

Bourdieu’s (1991) analysis of regional identities seems particularly applicable to the Roma case. In the case of Roma, due to the fact that all the actors developing discourse around ethnicity (universities, research institutes, think tanks, governments and non-governmental organizations, international, transnational and intergovernmental organizations, mass media) have the power and legitimacy to make such a discourse, the Gypsy/Roma ethnicity acquired public expression and recognition in a relatively short time, even in the former communist countries where ethnic divisions were not manifest. Institutions working within the ethnic division frame of Roma vs. non-Roma acquired more relevance also because their different types of discourse reinforce and legitimate each other (political through academic, journalistic through political, etc.).

The construction of the Gypsy/Roma ethnicity concept also indicates that the academic community and, more specifically, social scientists have an active role in framing, widely circulating, and reproducing a Gypsy/Roma ethnicity. Moreover, in crafting Gypsy/Roma ethnicity, scientists build an object of study in the research traditions of their different branches of specialization, hence assigning the particularities of their specific field and dispositions to their purported object of study: Roma have been counted and mapped by statisticians, sociologists, and economists; they have been classified by ethnographers and physical anthropologists; they have been modeled and projected as a specific population by demographers; measured by psychologists; photographed by experts all over the fields; and their DNA profile was shaped by geneticists. All these specific scientific practices have contributed to the advancement of Roma ethnicity as an objective and measurable entity.

To sum up, ethnicity in its current use is an arbitrary mode of artificially carving up social reality, and the case of Roma, as I will demonstrate in what follows, is a case in point. Sorting into ethnic categories is the result of an institutionalization process, shaped by the social relationships between the social agents engaged in struggles of classification from which they derive benefits. The social sciences hold a privileged position not only in successfully constituting ethnicity as an object of study, but also in exporting the concept into other scien-

tific fields and everyday life. I illustrate by examples in Chapter 6 how knowledge about Roma as a coherent and homogenous ethnic group is imported into the standard narratives of human genetics from the accounts of the social sciences. Ethnic research findings are alarmingly ubiquitous, and they range from mass media to ethnic surveys, and from ethnic census data to population and medical genetics research about human variation. Ethnicity is a concept applied to Roma today because of political reasons, and I will show in the next chapters why this is problematic.

2. ROMA ETHNICITY MEASUREMENT IN SOCIOLOGICAL SURVEYS

How Roma representative samples are made

In the countries of Central and Eastern Europe during the last two decades Roma populations have been under siege by (public and private) research institutes and agencies. Yet, little attention was given to how Roma ethnicity is assessed in surveys. Even less attention was granted to the relationship between social theory on ethnicity and quantitative research on Roma.

In Romania, for example, between 2000 and 2008 there were at least 18 nationwide research projects conducted by professional polling agencies that elaborated big and supposedly representative Roma samples (see Rughiniş 2012). Probably many smaller research projects (professional and amateur) were carried out by questioning the same Roma subjects, not to mention the large number of NGOs that made their own in-house research projects (often with no or little professional preparation), which intruded once again upon Roma households and privacy. Beyond surveillance carried out in the name of research, many other documentary and celebratory visits were made in the same Roma communities by political actors, Roma leaders, journalists, and filmmakers.

In most of the Roma-related quantitative studies, the Roma ethnicity is set as an independent and categorical variable, usually in the same group with other socio-demographic variables, such as age, sex, occupation, education level, or marital status. The use of ethnicity in the

explanatory models of social research is found in a variety of quantitative studies, which aim to describe various phenomena of social differentiation such as poverty, cultural consumption, educational status, and social mobility. Research design using ethnicity as an independent variable (often measured on nominal scales of exclusive ethnic categories) obscures the understanding of the socially constructed character of ethnicity through the reversal of *explanandum* (ethnicity) with the *explanans* (a social phenomenon such as poverty or social mobility). In most of the Roma-related quantitative surveys, ethnicity, instead of being explained as a product of processes of social differentiation, is treated as a cause of such processes: ethnicity is the cause of poverty and not *vice versa*. Quantitative research on Roma often arrives at equating poverty with ethnicity, ignoring the fact that an ethnic label could be misleadingly applied to the poor even due to the poverty situation itself. Poverty is a status easily objectified (measured) through residence in a deprived zone, for example, and as such could be often taken uncritically as a proxy for the Roma ethnicity. What is omitted is individual mobility in the social hierarchy, and the fact that when such mobility happens, the poverty label is removed, and in most of the cases the ethnic label is also removed together with it. For the purposes of quantitative research, those who move out from poverty stricken zones cease to have an ethnic label attached to them, and so they cease to be Roma subjects.

What is measured in research that explains poverty through ethnicity is not the concept of ethnicity, which is most often taken for granted, but the lesser or greater degree of poverty of a group compared with that of another group with a different ethnic label (which is also taken for granted). Or, in the very process of ethnic identity-making, it is the economic status, objectified in living in an impoverished residential area, which makes individuals ethnically identifiable as Roma (and sometimes to accept this ethnic label). Roma-related surveys direct the selection of units of analysis towards the most visible cases, which become representatives for the Roma community. To equate Roma with the poor, as the quantitative research too often does, means to assume that a group that has various other characteristics (linguistic, cultural, historical) is primarily distinguished by the lack of economic resources. Poverty comes to be seen as the main criterion for the representativeness of the Roma group and contributes to the illusion of the consistency and internal unity of the group. It seems that the lack of economic resources

determines group membership in the view of quantitative researchers, as if it reflects on how “representative” Roma samples are. Following the logic of social research addressing Roma poverty, ethnic borders are traced by economic criteria whatever “ethnic” characteristics people may have, and consequently a Manichean logic is unfolded: the poor are Roma and those less poor are not Roma.

Roma ethnicity is similarly treated when considered as an independent, explanatory variable in empirical research related to education. Most often, the argument of unequal educational opportunities is based on the assumption of ethnicity as an explanatory factor. Accordingly, the Roma pupils’ school achievements or the length of their school career are usually explained through ethnicity without looking at alternative explanations. Usually, studies about Roma education claim that ethnicity is responsible for a low educational level and disregard that a low level of education may push (self- or external) affiliation to an ethnic label. School achievements and vertical mobility due to education could be essential factors that are contributing to the affiliation with a socially more valuable ethnic identity. Policy research on Roma is less interested, if at all, in people crossing ethnic borders that occurs through acculturation and assimilation (massive phenomena in post-communist countries), when individuals leave their original groups, which are socially perceived as educationally backward or in which educational performance is considered a rather exceptional case. In fact, the introduction of ethnicity in quantitative statistical models hides the social differentiations with a higher degree of objectivity than that of ethnicity (as for example, the social status differences), and transposes the debate about social inequality from a class to an ethnic level. Nevertheless, longitudinal educational studies¹³ demonstrated that social class is the most important factor for an educational career; accordingly, a diminishment in social status disparities will be followed by an increase in school opportunities. Therefore, if the policy of equalization is to be sought in applied social research, it is more productive to use the concept of social class (or socio-economic status) instead of ethnicity. Empirical analyses of school career and policy

¹³ Some examples of these studies are: Jencks et al. (1972), Boudon (1974), Bowles and Gintis (1976), Breen and Goldthorpe (2001).

interventions based on those need to acknowledge that the class structure of society has a greater latency in time (at the aggregate level, the categories of social class are constant for long intervals of time), while ethnic categories are more fluid and more dynamic.

In the last two decades, a multitude of Roma-related policy research on the topic of education and poverty¹⁴ associates the Roma ethnicity with poverty and a low level of education. Consequently, social status descriptors are used to depict Roma as an ethnic group. One of the very few research projects which considers the Roma ethnicity as a dependent variable (that is built through the influence of other variables), is that of Ladányi and Szelényi (2001). These sociologists found that Roma ethnicity is the result of the intersection of classification procedures that involve three types of actors: (1) the subjects who self-identify as Roma; (2) the experts who produce categorizations based on their previous interactions with the population under scrutiny; and (3) the field operators that make ethnic identifications relying on common knowledge that are socially accredited. Ladányi and Szelényi's study in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania shows how empirical social research can contribute through its sampling procedures to the production (and manipulation) of ethnicity. In this study, researchers used three modalities to elaborate on "Roma" samples: self-identification, classification by the "experts," and classification by the field interviewers. In the first stage, field operators (from marketing research companies) screened 10,000 to 19,000 households from which they selected samples of 300 to 500 cases of households perceived as Roma. In the second phase of the research, a second set of field operators applied a questionnaire through which the subjects who were identified as Roma in the first stage were requested to certify or to reject their affiliation with the Roma group. Additionally, the second set of field operators was requested to categorize according to their own perception whether the household in which the questionnaire was applied is a Roma household. Identification made by the second set of field operators was realized after they learned the way in which subjects self-identified themselves in regard to their ethnic origin. The findings

¹⁴ Many of these research projects can be found on the Decade of Roma Inclusion website.

of the study show inconsistencies in ethnic classification between the two sets of field operators, especially in Hungary and in Romania: approximately one third of those categorized as Roma by the first set of operators were considered non-Roma by the second set of operators (those who finally applied the questionnaire). The second set of operators were unsure how to assign subjects' ethnicity, and after the questionnaire was applied the proportion of subjects that were reclassified with certainty as Roma was the following: 87.5% in Bulgaria, 48.5% in Hungary, and merely 37.5% in Romania. In regard to the self-identification of subjects, the study found that 73.3% in Bulgaria, 36.8% in Hungary, and 30.7% in Romania considered themselves as Roma.

We can agree with the main conclusion that Ladányi and Szelényi drew from the data sets: "the definition of Roma varies a great deal cross-culturally and depending who are the classifier" (2001, 86). The detailed presentation of the above study was done with the aim to demonstrate the strength of sociological research practices in regard to the social co-construction of ethnicity in general, and to that of the Roma ethnicity in particular. Roma ethnicity appears as a construction highly dependent on the sampling procedures and methodology of the applied social research. Beyond the artificiality of the research situation, a common bias of surveys and of opinion polls¹⁵ that affects policy research on Roma is that the Roma ethnic statistics produced by quantitative research ignore the situational and contextual character of ethnicity in everyday life.

In an overview of international and Romanian quantitative research on Roma, Rughiniş (2011, 2012) analyzes the use of Roma ethnicity as a variable in quantitative studies, as well as the various strategies of sampling utilized by researchers and statistical models for describing and profiling the Roma population. According to Rughiniş (2011), the most frequent use of ethnicity in quantitative studies about Roma is that of an independent and categorically constructed variable, held responsible for the discrepancies (or the gaps) between Roma and non-Roma in the social fields of, *inter alia*, education, employment, and religiosity. In most of the cases of quantitative research that use a gap model of analysis, as Rughiniş (2011) asserts, Roma are conceptualized

¹⁵ For criticism of the artificiality of surveys, see Cicourel (1982), and for the way in which public opinion is an artifact assembled by opinion polls, see Bourdieu (1972).

as individual bearers of an ethnicity that affects their educational or occupational status, instead of considering education and occupation as influencers of ethnic affiliations with the Roma group (or with the other groups). One of the pitfalls in the measurement and quantification of Roma ethnicity is that sampling occurs more often in homogenous neighborhoods, and those who are living in socially more diverse zones are constantly ignored by research on Roma (Rughiniş 2011).

The sampling strategies in the poorest Roma neighborhoods, as well as considering Roma ethnicity as a categorical and independent variable, may transform the academic researcher into a contributor to the reification, racialization, and stigmatization of the Roma group. In this regard, Rughiniş notes:

The most obvious ethical and political risks related to quantitative research using ethnicity refer to the racialization of ethnic groups, by consolidating stereotypical portraits with the cement of scientific authority and quantitative precision. This is an obvious risk for quantitative investigations of ethnic differences in ‘general mental ability’ or deviant behaviors, for example, but also a collateral damage of repeated measurement of ethnic gaps in fields like education, employment or gender equality. (2011, 614–615)

Inadequately captured Roma ethnicity in quantitative surveys that are done at a singular point in time (as in most of the policy research) is the argument proposed also by Simonovits and Kézdi (2013), and supported with empirical evidence. These authors use panel longitudinal surveys (repeated in time with the same sample of subjects) for studying the issue of Roma identity formation and its transformation over time. Research that uses a one-time sample in fact works with non-representative universes¹⁶ of study and, accordingly, draws biased

¹⁶ *Handbook of Survey Household* suggests: “The population or universe represents the entire group of units which is the focus of the study. Thus, the population could consist of all the persons in the country, or those in a particular geographical location, or a special ethnic or economic group, depending on the purpose and coverage of the study. A population could also consist on [*sic*] non-human units such as farms, houses or business establishments” (*Handbook of Survey Household* 1984, 19).

conclusions about Roma ethnicity. In order to show the transformation of Roma ethnic identity (both assimilation and preservation), the study used a large database of 10,000 families in Hungary over a period of six years. Simonovits and Kezdi found in their study

...evidence that suggests that Romani ethnicity is a continuous construct that is imperfectly measured in cross sectional surveys. Our analysis about adolescents and their parents reveals that social status and the ethnic composition of the network in which adolescents grow up has an important role in conditioning the intergenerational transmission of ethnic identity... It appears that changes in social status have genuine effects on self reported ethnicity, with social marginalization leading to an increased likelihood of Romani identification. (2013, 2)

The measurement of Roma ethnicity through a categorical variable is shown to be misleading, as those who share a Roma identity also claim a Hungarian identity, if a question is provided in this way. Inversely, when a question that allows for multiple ethnicities is put, some of those who prefer a Hungarian self-reported ethnicity, when asked for a single and exclusive ethnicity, can also associate themselves with Roma identity. Asking someone to choose a single ethnic box (as most research on Roma and censuses in CEE so far have done) obscures that those classified merely as Roma admit, in fact, to having a double ethnic identity: "...in Hungary, virtually everyone with a Roma identity also has a Hungarian identity" (ibid., 16). The question the authors used for recording ethnicity, which is very similar to the one introduced as an innovation by the Hungarian 2011 census, is the following: "In our country people belong to different minorities and ethnic groups. What ethnic group do you consider to belong to primarily? And what ethnic group do you consider to belong to secondarily?" (ibid., 8). The subjects of the research had the possibility to freely chose two ethnicities from many categories. A conclusion of the study was that a more accurate measurement of Roma identity could be made using a continuous variable with different degrees of intensity, and a categorical choice between Roma and non-Roma is an oversimplification. Moreover, the intergenerational transmission of Roma identity and its strength also depend on the social status of the family, as well as self-identification as Roma of one or both of the parents.

In Roma-related quantitative research, the samples are almost always recruited from poor communities, and this issue is rarely debated in social sciences and accounted for in policy-making. For quantitative research, a Roma middle class does not exist: “Traditionally, research on the Romani population has centred on what occurs in the lowest layers of society” (Prieto-Flores, Puigvert, and Santa Cruz 2012, 194). The availability issues and cost-related reasons could make poor communities repeatedly the “favorite” place of social research on Roma. People living in such communities are continually brought to exemplify the ethnic group of Roma.

*Framing questions and interpreting findings
in Roma-related surveys*

Recent, multi-agency research on Roma appealed to a preliminary survey in order to avoid duplicating the work of field operators employed by the two partners agencies involved in the joint research. To avoid doubling the work, a preliminary questioning of the subjects about whether a field operator of the partner organization already visited or not the household was arranged. The caution in regard to work duplication is mentioned in the following joint report:

FRA and UNDP contractors exchanged maps and starting points for random route sampling to avoid duplication. To ensure that no household or respondent was interviewed twice, interviewers for both surveys asked the following question: “Have you or another member of your household participated in a survey related to Roma since May 15?” Respondents who confirmed that their household had already participated in such an interview were not interviewed again. (FRA 2013, 15)

The repeated visits in the same community and knocking on the same doors are certainly intrusive acts into people’s lives, who are transformed into objects of monitoring, interviewing, and observation. On the one hand, the over-questioning of people due to the constant interest of researchers in the same communities might leave traces on those frequently questioned, and probably make them feel that they are part of a special population under surveillance. On the other hand,

these methodological cautions to insure that no person was interviewed twice denote a kind of scarcity of the would-be Roma subjects.

The supposedly representative Roma samples are built, as with any other survey, on cost-reduction criteria. In addition, constructing a Roma sample often involves the selection of communities and individuals that is not random, but driven by specific criteria of availability. One of the frequently used criteria for selecting a community to be included in a Roma sample is the activity of Roma NGOs in that locality. There are also localities selected as Roma communities, which were included previously in other research about Roma, being therefore ante-marked by researchers as Roma communities. It is inside these pre-selected communities where a random selection is performed, thus random selection does not apply for the whole population of an administrative unit (usually a country). And yet, in many Roma-related research projects, this pre-selected randomness is brought as an argument for claiming the representativeness of the samples. In a few cases of policy papers, it is briefly admitted in the methodology section that sampling may not represent the whole Roma population. But even in such cases acknowledging the sampling limitations, throughout the entire text authors refer to Roma in general. While for methodological cautions (when present) a footnote or part of an annex are allocated, which are usually less read, generalizations about a whole Roma group are ubiquitous and very visible in the text, often starting with the title.

It is very rare or quasi-absent for a policy publication to mention that the research is done using convenient samples, and, consequently, that the research outcomes are at best exploratory and cannot be in any way extrapolated or generalized to the entire Roma population. Moreover, in the case of Roma it is conceptually impossible to have randomness for a population which has not been previously defined, or which is haphazardly amalgamated for instrumental reasons. Often quantitative research presents its findings as being applicable to (all) Roma from a country, and further on comparisons made between (all) Roma from different countries culminate in discussion about (all) *Roma from Europe*. The meaning of such a large reference remains abstruse, since there is no common denominator for groups and individuals who speak different languages, have different traditions and religions, different citizenships and cultural affinities, and yet they are easily brought in broad brush strokes under the same category. Roma

from Hungary, for example, are much closer to Hungarians than to the Roma from Serbia: the language and their habits, traditions, and cultural preferences are likely much closer to those of the surrounding population than to Roma people from other countries.

Weaknesses in Roma ethnicity measurement in surveys are largely related to sampling as well as to questionnaire design. Ethnicity is measured by closed questions, which contain exclusive ethnic categories: the respondent has to make choices from a predetermined list of ethnic categories. A list of ethnic categories, however exhaustive it may be, is inherently and drastically limited when compared to the identity self-associations that individuals may have. In research where the sample targets are from poverty-stricken zones that are acknowledged to have a certain ethnic composition (as, in fact, the quasi-totality of Roma-related research is), it is difficult, if not impossible, for the subject to exit from the pressure of a dichotomous question about ethnic identification. The closed questions compel the respondents to choose from pre-defined answers in a face-to-face interaction with the interview operator. In terms of agency, what is given to the subject is a definition of ethnicity (which could be taken or left out) but not a possibility to co-define it: the subject has merely to ratify an external definition advanced by the social researcher. The respondent has to comply therefore with a taken-for-granted categorization, which is given an appearance of universality, and in which *definiendum* and *definiens* are a matter of tacit knowledge. Dichotomous questions (*yes* or *no*) that address ethnicity give a false choice, assuming an ethnic identity insofar as there is a constraint in taking sides and associating or dissociating from an ethnic identity. In those cases when the ethnic identity is a stigmatized one, as it is in the case with Roma, the forced choice imposed by a closed question could be at least an unpleasant experience for the subjects who are ambivalent in assuming an ethnic identity.

In the Roma-related surveys that have the household as a unit of analysis, when a member of a household self-declares him/herself as Roma, usually the entire household by default is registered as a Roma household. It is the same logic that was applied in the past during Gypsy slavery, when a non-Gypsy marrying a Gypsy automatically was ranked as a Gypsy, together with the children resulting from the marriage. This logic is also very similar to the “one blood drop” rule that applied in the US census until recently, when multi-racial categories were included.

Moreover, in most of the Roma-related social research by European academics, the consent of subjects to participate in the research is an implicit one, and only very few research projects acknowledge an explicit and written consent. This implicit consent is often gained by nurturing the subjects' expectations that the research may have future positive consequences for community life, if not for the individual who participates in the research. These expectations were very rarely fulfilled.

In fact, survey data are manipulated and crafted (by the formulation of the questionnaire items, placement of the items in the questionnaire, introduction formula in addressing subjects, type of measurement scales, and other biases related to field operators' behavior and training) long before being entered in the computer database where these data are considered as empirical, raw data. To take one example, that of the introductory formula to a questionnaire, it could be observed how this formula establishes from the beginning the relationship and catches the roles of interviewer and interviewed. The following quote illustrates how a direct and intrusive introductory question was used in a Roma-related survey in eleven countries in Eastern and Western Europe:

For household screening, the interviewers used a screening sheet. During the first visit, the interviewer asked the person who opened the front door: "Could you tell me if any Roma live in this household? By 'household', I mean all the people who live within this accommodation and with whom you share cooking and meals." This screener question helped to identify Roma households where at least one member was identified as Roma, as well as non-Roma households where no member was identified as Roma. (FRA 2013, 14)

Statistical findings presented in terms of ethnic categories, either from censuses or from surveys, become arguments in political and journalistic types of discourse and contribute to the inculcation of common beliefs, promoting differences rather than similarities among people. Research findings and analyses of "empirical" data are made available to the public (where they acquire credit and legitimacy) without an acknowledgment of the research *modus operandi* through which scientific selections and managerial decisions have been made. In many

research reports about Roma, from which the public receive information that grounds their beliefs, a description of the research methods and limitations is often missing. For example, sampling strategies are downplayed (not specifying the population or universe from which a sample is drawn, lacking statistical representativeness), questionnaires and interview guides are usually missing from the annexes, so that critical evaluation of research design and its biases is prevented. Moreover, research objectives and problem definition, and thus the very topic of the research itself, are often framed in a way to reflect the interests of the sponsors (donors), which are often political bodies. As a result, research about Roma incorporates political knowledge into supposedly neutral and apolitical research.

Comparisons among ethnic groups are becoming futile when the surveyed subjects could simultaneously stand for two or more ethnic categories, yet surveys on Roma prevent this by using exclusive categories. In other words, the researcher finds those identities (and collectivities) that he/she is willing to look for due to the conceptual searching enterprise that aims to find what has been initially planned. Researchers involved in Roma surveys not only confirm the administrative practice of census-taking (whose arbitrary nature I hope to demonstrate in Chapter 4), but also they often confirm the essentialist assumptions that guide the research design. Embarking on applied sociological research with the idea of searching for ethnic groups is likely to end by finding these groups (which are known in advance to be there). This maneuver of Roma “discovery” presupposes the repetition and replication of research in which ethnicity is taken for granted.

Poverty-related research about Roma (which is a considerable part of quantitative research about Roma) fails to convincingly argue that discrimination against Roma is ethnic and not social: comparing Roma with low socio-economic status with non-Roma as a whole means, in fact, to acknowledge social discrimination but not necessarily ethnic discrimination. A proper demonstration of ethnic discrimination against Roma (existent but undemonstrated) would require a comparison among individuals (Roma and non-Roma) who have the same socio-economic status but whom institutions or people treat differently. Misrecognition and mistaking social discrimination for ethnic discrimination makes social discrimination normalized and legitimate, by relegating it to the ethnic field.

Despite the fact that social theory consistently moved from the understanding of ethnicity as a given and objective social fact to a relational, situational, and contextual approach, the Roma-related quantitative research in the field of policy has remained trapped within an essentialist vision, which considers ethnicity as a natural phenomenon. For applied sociology and administrative practices of census-taking, the gathering of ethnic data remains largely founded on primordialist assumptions, which do not allow for multiple ethnic identification, dis-identification, or the possibility to not ethnically self-identify. Whereas the methods and methodologies used in producing scientific knowledge about Roma are questionable, applied sociology is used for its authority status and serves to justify and ratify political actions. In its social engineering role, the sociological scientific *praxis*, which produces ethnic classifications and categorizations, serves to fulfill, for better or worse, the potential of political power of the time. In the next chapter, I argue that profiling Roma in quantitative policy research follows the path and logic of an old tradition of external police identification of Gypsies/Roma, with which it shares the propensity toward the standardization of Roma ethnic identity.

Chapter 3

Disciplinary Traditions in the Study of Roma

After an overview of theories of ethnicity and Roma-related survey practices in the previous chapter, I now turn the focus to the main disciplinary traditions that produced a Roma-related discourse with relevance to the contemporary categorization of the group. I consider in this chapter the disciplinary fields of linguistics, history, anthropology, and political science for an overview of the main perspectives on Roma, as well as for pointing out the mutual borrowings among fields and the distinctiveness of each field's research tradition. In this regard, I consider chronologically research done by police, as the precursor of modern policy research, with three arguments: its drive for the quantification of a Roma population, the standardization of the interview, and its appeal to state intervention and surveillance. Continuities and differences in the frames applied to Roma by research traditions, apparently as distant as those of police surveys and policy analysis, are part of the overview. I look also at the way in which history and political science agree or disagree on who the most important categorizers of Roma are. In the latter aspect, I claim that on the one hand, historians put the onus on academic scholars for the emergence of the Roma ethnic group consciousness, but they fail to connect with the more recent history and to acknowledge the role played by international organizations in framing the Roma group. On the other hand, political scientists concentrate mainly on the present and on political actors that define Roma, but they discard the past and ignore actors who are not part of the con-

temporary political sphere. Classifications and descriptions of Roma by the academic community and governmental bodies, agreeing with Willems (1997), were historically justified by economic considerations. Throughout history, Gypsies/Roma were targeted by policies of exploitation, exclusion, assimilation and, respectively, inclusion that were based on an economic rationale. The aim of this chapter is to bring together these scattered perspectives to give a broad image of the most important actors involved in constituting the Roma ethnic identity. In doing so, I take into account the *longue durée* process of emerging and establishing Roma as an ethnic identity, and the political and academic actors involved in defining Roma as an ethnic group; these should be regarded as co-constructors of group identity.

1. FROM POLICE PROFILING TO POLICY RESEARCH PROFILES

One of the oldest traditions systematically used to conduct research about Gypsies/Roma in a quantitative manner and with instruments of modern science, is tied to the institution of the police. This research tradition fueled the social imaginary, from which scientists and experts derived their knowledge, while the police institution in its professionalization appealed to scientific knowledge and an increasing number of scientists for their endeavors.

The interplay between police and policy science was developed over a long duration and contributed to the *emplotment* of Gypsies as an object of their discourse and activity. The connection between police and policy science, that seems nowadays rather artificial, could be seen in the filiation of the policy science, from the *science of police* in the processes of autonomization, and secularization of the states, or more precisely the nation-states. The *science of police* is the progressive realization of both repressive and paternalistic functions of the state in relationship to society as a whole, a discipline constituted as an object of science of government during modern history:

...“the science of police” is only the culmination of a whole vast literature, today largely neglected, which traverses the whole of the modern period, accompanying and supporting the con-

struction of the social order we have known since the century of Enlightenment, whose beginnings we might guess lie considerably further back in time. This literature, or rather body of knowledge, of *police*, known in the eighteenth century as both the 'science of happiness' and the 'science of government,' which constitute society as the object of knowledge and at the same time as the target of political intervention. . . . (Pasquino 1991, 108)

The police as a repressive institution acquired a negative significance only in the late eighteenth century. Until this date, the police as an institution, and the science derived from its functions (police science), have been understood as a totalizing body of knowledge making the good functioning of public interest and economy possible. A bibliography of the police science publications (in German-speaking areas) counts no less than 3,125 titles between the years 1600 and 1800 (Pasquino 1991). What has been divided nowadays as objects of study of the departmentalized social sciences (including applied policy research) was in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries the overall comprehensive object of study of police science: "Police is a science of endless lists and classifications; there is a police of religion, of customs, of health, of foods, of highways, of public order, of sciences, commerce, manufactures, servants, poverty . . ." (Gordon 1991, 10).

Since the police was supposed to classify almost everything that existed, the process of classifying and categorizing Gypsies came naturally within the view with the professionalization of the police. In this process of categorizing Gypsies, an important role was played by the emerging police journals and by the possibility offered by these journals for a large scale collaboration among police professionals.¹ Lucassen (1998) convincingly makes the case that police professionalization in Germany that started in the eighteenth century was instrumental in forging the label of Gypsies (*Zigeuner*) and reuniting diverse and unrelated groups of people under the same category, especially those with an itinerant lifestyle and without fixed residency. If at the beginning the police produced its own lists and classifications, with

¹ Lucassen (1998) identified in Germany between 1802 and 1920 eight police journals that published about Gypsies.

time its professionalization implied the academization of the field by co-opting and seeking collaboration with scientists in offering explanations and solutions for deviance in a society with a rapid process of urbanization and modernization. As Foucault (1984a) argues, the police, as a specific type of governmental rationality and as a way of governing the state, was supposed to mirror the spatial organization of the city with its center and periphery.

In its early stages, towards the end of nineteenth century, the science of criminology inspired by biological determinism theory of “born criminal,” developed by Cesare Lombroso, made Gypsies an example of a population to be identified and controlled by the police. Even though Lombroso’s biological theory of criminality was received with circumspection and rejected within the circles of criminologists in Germany,² France,³ and Romania,⁴ for example, this widely circulated and shared theory in international criminological congresses introduced and preserved the surveillance of Gypsies by the police as a routine practice, which continues in relation to Roma even today.

Anthropometry (measurement of different parts of the body) was introduced into police work in France first by Alphonse Bertillon around the 1880s, but rapidly spread globally as a method for establishing and fixing identity in an attempt to discern among the first time offenders and recidivists, and to verify the declarations of suspects about their identity.⁵ Nevertheless, from being initially a technique of identification of delinquents and suspects, *bertillonage* (police anthro-

² For criticism of biological-deterministic theories in Germany during the Weimar Republic, but also during national socialism, see Wetzell (2000).

³ See, for example, Kaluszynski (2009).

⁴ See, for example, the critical reception of Lombroso’s theory of “born criminal” by Minovici (1896), the founder of the medico-legal discipline in Romania. On a large number of cases (7,217) of convicts of all nationalities (including “*țigani*”) in Romanian prisons, he found a huge variability of body, skull characteristics, and physiognomy, this way refuting Lombroso’s theory. Minovici concluded that “It cannot be said that criminals are born but that man becomes criminal. Social misery, ignorance, bad examples, laziness, and the influence of environment—these are the efficient causes of criminality” (1896, 35; author’s translation).

⁵ For the spread of anthropometric police identification, introduced by Bertillon, and eventually its replacement by fingerprinting, see Ruggiero (2001) for Argentina, and Joseph (2001) for the United Kingdom.

pometry, including the use of forensic photography) came soon to be applied to the identification of Gypsies and nomads, who were seen in France as a threat to national security (Kaluszynski 2001; Fillhol 2007). In 1893, the Hungarian Ministry of Interior carried out one of the earliest censuses targeting Gypsies (see Willems 1997, 180).⁶ Special censuses of nomads and Gypsies were introduced by the police as early as 1895 in France, and special identity papers for Gypsies—the so-called *carnet anthropometrique de nomade*—were required by law in 1912 and were kept in use until 1969; as it seems, even today in France special papers for Gypsies are a means of identity verification by police (Kaluszynski 2001).⁷ Yet, *carnet de nomade* was to a large extent applied also to relatively large groups of French citizens who lost their jobs during the economic crisis in the 1930s, as the paper allowed them not to be charged with vagrancy (see About 2012, 109–110). Identification work carried out by the police through scientific means (anthropometry measurements, fingerprint, photography, and censuses) prefigured the total registration of Sinti and Roma in the national socialist period in Germany; their deportation and extermination in concentration camps while in France during the Second World War, registration of Gypsies by the police expedited their internment in camps (ibid.). The French law inspired also Czechoslovakia to make the registration of Gypsies by the police and their identification by special papers compulsory. In this regard, Czechoslovakia adopted a Gypsy identity card in 1927, a document mirroring the French model of *carnet anthropometrique de nomade* (see Donert 2008). Beyond the surveillance of individuals labeled by the police as Gypsies/Roma, during the interwar period in Romania, for example, attempts at their mobilization in a Romani movement were also closely monitored by the same institution, and it was treated as a matter of national security.⁸

After some time, more important than different stand-alone Gypsy classifications were those which had the capacity to bypass

⁶ About describes this census as “a national census of all ‘nomads, bohemians and vagrants’ travelling in France” (2012, 103).

⁷ For a history of the identification and surveillance of Gypsies by police in France since the nineteenth century, see also About (2012).

⁸ See the collection of archival documents edited by Nastasă and Varga (2001).

borders and become incorporated in the classifications produced by other professional communities: this way, definitions were gradually universalized for the general use of the public. In his *Zigeuner-Buch*, Alfred Dillmann, a lawyer by profession and the chief of the Bavarian police, elaborated on the classification of Gypsies since 1905, which in some time has been substituted by sociological definitions of Gypsies (Lucassen 1998). Based on Dillmann's definition of Gypsies—"everyone who travels with his or her family irrespective of ethnicity or nationality" (quoted in Lucassen 1998, 40)—the Bavarian police compiled a registry of 3,350 names under the label of Gypsies. This definition of Gypsies used by the police was drawn from an ethnographic description of the German scholar Grellmann (Willems 1997). This early police registry of people labeled as Gypsies was later developed (under national socialism) and the number of those so registered increased tenfold. This increase cannot be explained, as Lucassen (1998) argues, merely by the extension of the authority of the Munich police to the national level or by demographic changes, but was due in part to the flexible categorization that allowed more people with a Gypsy lifestyle to be included into these statistics. The police registers were most probably taken over by Gypsy experts, such as Robert Ritter and his team (Lucassen 1998), who continued to apply genealogical methods (primarily introduced by the police) to decide who is a Gypsy and who is not, and for those assigned as Gypsies, how pure or impure they were. A collaborator of Ritter, Dr. Sophie Erhardt, continued to work on Gypsy-related research material collected during the Nazi period at the University of Tübingen until the beginning of the 1970s (Müller-Hill 1988). It was rather Ritter's personal connections within the German police, and the desire of the Nazi officials to find scientific legitimization of their racist prejudices associating Gypsies with criminality, than the reception of Ritter's research in criminological circles that helped his fast ascension as director of the Criminal-Biological Institute of the Security Police (see Wetzell 2000). Ritter's research, aiming at the complete registration and sorting of Gypsies in Germany, has decisively contributed to their imprisonment and extermination in concentration camps during the national socialist era, and the "voluntary" sterilization of those exempted (Müller-Hill 1988).

Therefore, police activity makes an object of inquiry from Gypsies/Roma through the very procedure of numbering and catego-

rizing. Special censuses counting Roma (hence their precise numbering) made by the police were a constant practice during history. In recent times, special censuses of Roma were carried out in repressive political regimes, such as national socialism and communism.⁹ Yet, the surveillance of Roma by the police resulting in their counting and registration was recently documented in Sweden, where a police database of 4,029 cases, including children, elders, and people without any previous convictions, was legally questioned by the authorities.¹⁰ In 2010, the French press signaled an interministerial database used by Gendarmerie, built in 1997 for the purpose of monitoring the criminality of Gypsies, Roma, and Travellers (About 2012).

Nowadays, the institutions of police and academia seem to be, at first glance, two institutions that have nothing or little in common. However, when it comes to constituting Gypsies as an object of their activities, these two institutions share some similarities. It is not only Gypsies as an object of study that both police and policy science assemble and use, but it is also the methodological apparatus to scrutinize, describe, make recommendations about, and interact with their object of interest that is functionally equivalent. The similarity between the two institutions in their focus on Gypsies is based on the classification procedures, which police and academic practices employ for designating the group. However, similarities between the two institutions cease to exist after Gypsies are constituted as an object of activity: for the police, Gypsies are the usual suspects for criminal behavior, whereas for policy research, they are the subjects of policy measures for social integration. While the police acts towards Gypsies with the repressive force of the state, policy research appeals for Roma integration through the benevolent action of the same state. Repression and paternalism are carried out by different institutions of the state based on a shared understanding of who Gypsies are: institutional practices, performed by aca-

⁹ For the census of Gypsies carried out by the Bulgarian Ministry of Interior and ordered by the Communist Party, see Liègeois (1994, 2007), UNDP (2002), and the World Bank (2000). I discuss the use of data collected by the police during communism in policy studies in Chapter 4.

¹⁰ See *Reuters* article on September 23, 2013, "Police database of Roma stirs outrage in Sweden," <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/09/23/us-sweden-roma-idUSBRE98M0EM20130923> (accessed October 30, 2014).

demics and by the police, produce explicit or implicit definitions of the Gypsy group through an active process of stigma construction.

Perhaps the isomorphism between police and policy science as knowledge production fields is most obvious in the way in which both institutions, acting in the name of achieving societal aims, have crafted Gypsies as an object of their activity. The two institutions, based on the rationale of social intervention (imprisonment and integration, respectively), see Gypsies as a unitary group that should be targeted in order to change their behavior, making them conform with the state's logic of economic productivity. In building their object of activity, both police and policy research use the procedure of *ethnic profiling* in order to isolate Gypsies as a group that is different from others. For the police, ethnic profiling is the procedure of scrutinizing individuals based on their physical appearance,¹¹ and comparing them to a pre-existing definition of the suspected with criminality. Where such instructions are not in place, ethnic profiling simply relies on previous routines of identificatory practices. During ethnic profiling by the police, all individuals sharing characteristics such as darker skin, poor dressing, careless physical appearance, and, needless to say, an itinerant lifestyle, are thought to belong to the group that is labeled for convenience as (the group of) Gypsies. As I detail later on (in Chapters 5 and 6), after 1990 a number of international organizations have conducted or sponsored their own policy studies about Roma, thus making Roma a target group for social policies, and in the meantime contributing to their categorization. Classifications of Roma for policy purposes sometimes involve stigmatizing images of the group that resemble the representations of Roma by the police: a marginal and deviant group. Among the most important studies published under the aegis of international organizations are those of the World Bank (2000, 2002, 2005), which established Roma as a target group for anti-poverty measures, those of the UNDP (2002, 2006a, 2006b), which framed Roma as a group "at risk" and as dependent on welfare benefits, and those of the Council of Europe (Liègeois 1994) that provided the first (and since fixed) estimation of Roma population size in Europe.

¹¹ As Lucassen (1998) acknowledges, the indication of Gypsies as dark-skinned people for police officers appears in the *Zigeuner-Buch* of Dillmann since 1905.

It is in the above mentioned examples of research and many others in which the academic “profiling” of Gypsies manifests in the *practice of sampling* by constitution of representative samples of Gypsies. As shown in the previous chapter, representativeness in sampling procedures is based on the researchers’ pre-existing definitions of what a typical Roma individual and a typical Roma community should be. Samples consist of individuals drawn from pre-selected communities that have characteristics fitting the pre-existing definition. The randomness of Roma samples happens only inside of such homogenous communities, and no Roma is looked upon in the wider society because the Roma “suspects” of policy research are to be found in Roma communities, and only there. Similar to the police practice of ethnic profiling, researchers or interview operators select persons based on visual inspection, which is accompanied by a convenient question aiming to affirm by the respondent that his/her selection for the sample was appropriate. The researcher, in a similar way as a policeman, is oriented towards people who share certain characteristics that correspond to his pre-determined definition of Gypsy/Roma individual: poverty, darker skin appearance, and living in a ghetto type of community with basic infrastructure. Neither the policeman nor the policy researcher will search for Gypsies outside their own definitions: such endeavors of looking for Gypsies in different social strata and neighborhoods, or considering other physical appearances will be considered as inefficient and unreliable searches. The criminal Gypsy stereotype orients the policeman in stopping and detaining people, while in the case of policy research, the poor Gypsy stereotype directs the researcher in making up a corresponding sample.

Both the police and the academic community have the power of imposing stigma on their subjects: the first has the authority given by its status of law enforcement, while the latter has the power coming from its symbolic legitimacy. Both institutions ask Roma to identify themselves, certify their identity, subscribe to an identity, and to admit it. The policeman who stops a Roma does not directly ask for an ethnic identity because such a question makes no sense, as far as the very reason for stopping the Roma is the result of a previously perceived Roma ethnicity. The policeman is asking instead for an identity proof that would attest that the person being stopped is registered in a population registry. This registration, if it exists, would remove suspicion, albeit for the time being only. For a person being stopped and

asked to assume an *ad hoc* identity in front of a policeman, having the signs of a suspected identity is the reason for being stopped. Usually, the policeman does not stop Roma inside homogenous communities, but only those travelling outside these communities and suspected of being Roma. Also, the policeman rarely stops Roma who do not fit the typical Roma image or who are accompanied by non-Roma people.

The researcher also assumes the right to identify and to probe someone's identity, but this time an explicit ethnic identity is sought by a direct question in a survey (e.g., "To which ethnic group do you belong?"). Being questioned by the researcher, the person of presumed Roma ethnicity should certify his ethnic appurtenance not through presenting a document, but by being present in his or her own milieu, in a Roma community, and answering questions on a Roma-related survey topic. One would not be asked questions in a survey about Roma without being "suspected" by the researcher of being a suitable candidate for the research. Both the policeman and the researcher are compelling the person to take a stance with respect to his/her own identity if he/she happens to be perceived, even only in their eyes, as Roma.

After being stopped either by the police or by the researcher, what follows next is an interview. The next sequence after identification is to perform a semi-guided discussion. The policeman's interview is usually shorter than the researcher's, but both have some common and inevitable questions about work place, residence, age, marital status, and number of children (in research parlance, socio-demographic variables). Both the policeman and the researcher will record the answers in their notebooks and later on transcribe them in databases, which are filled with useful cases that they have to keep under observation and monitor, not necessarily because individuals have done something wrong, but because they are in the position of a *suspect* and a *subject*, respectively. Both the policeman and the researcher come back to their cases once they have registered them in a database. The researcher who makes a panel research will return to the community sooner or later to carry out a new research with the same questions applied to the same subjects. As far as someone is included in a database, he/she cannot escape from the identificatory practices of policemen or researchers due to the simple fact that they have already been inscribed in an official database (sometimes with an ethnic identity attached). Yet, ethnic identity is not allowed to be registered in official documents in many countries.

Some reports are made afterwards by both policemen and researchers: the policeman reports a number of suspects (with their addresses and employment status), and the researcher also makes his reports recording subjects' life conditions, occupation, or educational status. However, the clustering of suspects and subjects in databases demands follow-up work that consists of monitoring and continuous observance.

To sum up, police research on Roma that started in Western Europe as early as the eighteenth century, and gradually incorporated scientific methods and theories of identification, classification, counting, and description of Roma, could be seen as the precursor of modern policy research on Roma. For policy practice, the recurrent urgency is to find a numerical size of the Roma population, since it is argued that such a number is useful to better shape the policy recommendations, and to secure funds for solving Roma-related policy issues. While the two fields that produce knowledge about Roma diverge greatly in their aims, they nevertheless share a common propensity towards the codification and quantification of difference, and both act from a position of authority, assuming moral prerogatives in backing their knowledge claims. The police justifies identification and surveillance of Roma with their aim of defending society, and therefore strives to control Roma mobility and enforce social conformity (or conversely, proceeds to imprisonment), while what is at stake in mapping Roma poverty in policy research is the management of the poor for their own good and for that of the larger society. In the long history of Roma enumeration and knowledge production, the policeman and the policy researcher seem to stand side by side.

2. ANTHROPOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL, AND LINGUISTIC ACCOUNTS OF ROMA

Linguistics and historiography of Roma

In the discipline of linguistics, Romani speakers were gradually stabilized as an epistemic object. While Grellmann's 1783 book¹² claimed that the Romani language has approximately one-third

¹² The English edition cited and referred to in the bibliography dates from 1787.

words of Indian origin, linguists' estimate today is that two-thirds of the Romani vocabulary consists of words of Indian origin (Hancock 1987). Contemporary linguists classify dialects of the Romani language according to linguistic borrowings and the influence from surrounding languages, such as the Balkan dialect of the Romani language with its Greek and Turkish influence, or North-Eastern dialects of Romani that formed while exchanging words with Polish, Baltic, and Russian languages (Matras 2002; Bakker and Matras 1997). Dialects are further subdivided along a variety of sub-dialects pertaining to their current users, categorized along ethnological descriptions. A central and ongoing controversy among linguists concerns the social position of Roma ancestors at the time they left India. The mainstream interpretation is that they were part of the lowest nomadic castes. However, the dissenting view of Hancock (2000), based on vocabulary analysis, asserts that Roma ancestors belong to the *Kshatriya* military elite caste, hence assuming a much higher social status and a "nobler" genealogy.

As Okely (1983) and Willems (1997) acknowledge, the primary sources for historical accounts on Roma are very limited. Accordingly, historiographies of Gypsies (written mostly by authors who did not self-identify as Gypsies or Roma) were highly repetitive, pointing to only a few available sources, such as legal and administrative documents, collections of folklore, legends, and literary sources. Moreover, these sources must be considered unreliable, as it is admitted even by those who argue that the group is homogenous, despite its huge diversity.

Contemporary historical studies narrate the history of Roma in a certain territory relying on evidence acquired from official documents. There are broader European-wide historiographies (Hancock 1987; Fraser 1992; Liègeois 1994) that describe the routes of Gypsy/Roma migration, as well as Roma presence and their persecution in countries where they settled, including expulsion, deportation, forced assimilation, and genocide. Regional historical or anthropological studies with considerable historical depth examine Roma history in Romania (Achim 2004), Bulgaria (Marushiakova and Popov 1997), Balkan countries (Marushiakova and Popov 2001a), Poland (Mróz 2015), Eastern Europe and especially Russia (Crowe 1994), Western Europe

(Lucassen, Willems, and Cottaar 1998), the United Kingdom (Okely 1983), and the United States (Hancock 1987). In addition, the history of Roma slavery in Romanian principalities (Potra [1939] 2001; Gheorghie 1983; Hancock 1987; Beck 1989; Achim 2004; Marushiakova and Popov 2009; Achim and Tomi 2010) as well as their persecution, deportations, and extermination during the national socialist regime in Germany are well documented.

Social history on Roma minoritization and stigmatization

Social history is in a good position to argue that Roma ethnicity is socially constructed, given the fact that historians are taking into account social facts and uncover tendencies over a long period of time, and hence their privilege in establishing the starting point of ethnicity formation, as well as its subsequent stages of development. However, the distinction between social history and social theory is becoming blurred, as many historians are looking for inspiration in the methodological and conceptual apparatus of sociology (Burke 1992), while many sociologists are also looking to bring temporal and historical aspects into their analyses.

Social historians introduced the stigmatization approach, which sustains that Gypsy ethnicity was a construction imposed from above by Western European governments through building and applying a stigma to a group of people who self-internalized the stigma associated with them without the possibility to define themselves or to challenge the definition of authoritative state institutions. Gypsy ethnicity and group consciousness might appear as the result of a long history of labeling, stigmatization, and the repressive control of the state, culminating in genocide under the national socialist German racial politics:

... it would be interesting to research the question to what extent the atrocities against Gypsies during the Nazi regime—and also in the period before—did stimulate the group formation and ethnicity. What was the relationship between labeling and ethnicity? Did Gypsies always regard themselves as *Sinti* or *Rom* or was this feeling reinforced or even initiated by a long period of stigmatization and labeling? (Lucassen 1998, 93; italics in original).

The contribution of social historians to advancing the understanding of Roma ethnicity as a social construction¹³ is an enterprise in which the sociological concept of stigma (famously introduced by Goffman in 1963) is employed for explaining the emergence and consolidation of the Gypsy category in historical perspective. The emergence of the Gypsy ethnic identity is the result of a stigmatization process, developed and continuously sustained for a long period of time by acts of categorization and labeling performed by social agents situated in a position of authority. The most important authorities responsible for categorizations of Gypsies are the police, governments, academics, and, needless to say, mass media. In this regard, through various case studies from Western Europe it was shown that Gypsy ethnic identity was developed historically as a result of governments' often repressive policy measures targeting people who are residentially mobile and treating them as if they were a unitary group, or more precisely an ethnic group (Lucassen, Willems, and Cottaar 1998). These governmental measures, usually carried out by the police, have led to the emergence of negative representations about the group among the public and reinforced the already existing negative images of the group disseminated by scholars and pseudo-scholars. After reviewing a large body of literature, expanding for over five centuries, Mayall (2004) points to the Gypsies/Roma socially constructed character, finding numerous inconsistencies, ambiguities, and contradictions in expert (political, academic, journalistic, literary, and juridical) classifications and descriptions. He concludes the following: "For many years, the ethnic school of Gypsiologists remains locked within the primordialist/ethnographic paradigm, reifying culture, stressing Indian origins, and keen to identify the elusive unifying core of Gypsiness" (Mayall 2004, 273). Even the constructivist academic accounts about Gypsies/Roma function only by challenging some essential premises (such as common Indian origin, shared language, nomadism, cultural core, racial type characteristics, etc.), but not most of the premises; moreover, the disqualification of some assumptions and theories occurs simultaneously with the accreditation of other suppositions or hypotheses that are

¹³ The social historians' view of Gypsy ethnic identity fits well in the general structure of the social constructivist explanation, as described by Hacking (1999).

equally unfounded (Mayall 2004). Along the lines of Willems (1997), who reviewed Dutch encyclopedias, Mayall (2004) also finds that some English encyclopedias during the nineteenth century contain academic definitions of Gypsies that are highly stereotypical, often presenting negative images, and rarely romanticized images of the group.

Therefore, the ethnic consciousness of the group that made Roma group formation possible is rather the result of a process of external stigmatization than the outcome of self-identification of those assigned the Gypsy ethnic label. Historically, the academic community and the political representatives interfered in the process of Gypsy stigmatization, and this process continues even today:

... the manner in which Gypsies have been and still are defined at the level of state and its officials demonstrates a clear connection with changing notions of the processes of categorization in sciences. ... Thus since the end of eighteenth century academics and amateur scientists have played a vanguard role in the process of defining Gypsies. (Lucassen, Willems, and Cottaar 1998, 7)

Historians challenge the assumption of an existing specific Gypsy culture in Western Europe, one that would be applicable to all members of the group and only to the members: the individuals and their families were brought together under the label of Gypsy rather for classificatory reasons and for social control than for objective characteristics that would apply exclusively to the Gypsy group. In this regard, an itinerant way of life, self-employment, family as a working unit, and the specificity of occupations attributed to Gypsies in governmental classificatory procedures in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Western Europe were not necessarily specific to Gypsies, but applicable to larger groups in society.

A powerful role in the historical stigmatization of Gypsies has been played by the academic community, either by official scientists or by those amateurs who were still seeking official academic recognition. With a particular interest in scholars and pseudo-scholars in analyzing the stigmatization of Gypsies, Willems (1997) searches for long-lasting invariants of the construction of Gypsy identity, precisely from the eighteenth century until the end of the Second World War. In his analysis, the image of Gypsies in society appears to have been primarily shaped

and popularized by intellectuals and scientists, as a result of publications written by folklorists, ethnologists, linguists, historians, eugenic researchers, criminal biologists, and fiction writers. Willems (1997) focuses on the most influential books and papers of the (pseudo) scientists, those whose Gypsy-related work appears to have been the most quoted from a very large body of such literature.¹⁴ The image of Gypsies, as constructed in the field of pseudo-science (although in its context and at the time it was considered to be official science), in its early stages appears as an uncritical and unreliable collection of stereotypes, continuously produced and reproduced through publications.

Beyond the construction of Gypsy ethnicity in the field of (pseudo-) science, the study of Gypsies and the assumption of one unitary group that shares specific cultural characteristics was heavily influenced by the image constructed in fictional literature, from which early Gypsiology borrowed the stereotypical repertoire that inscribed Gypsies/Roma in the registry of marginality. A recurrent theme of Gypsies' (un)productivity, initially put in circulation in 1783 by Grellmann, one of the most influential authors of the period whose publications had numerous followers, frames Gypsies as a potential economic investment meant to transform an unproductive and therefore not socially useful category of people into economically productive and useful citizens: "Just imagine the Gypsy ceased to be a Gypsy; with his fertility and his numerous offspring, all transformed into useful citizen; then one is able to fill how economically wasteful it would be to throw them away like snails" (Grellmann 1783, 1; quoted in Willems 1997, 29).

In the period of national socialism in Germany, research developed by Robert Ritter on Gypsies' asociality had economic arguments as its main justification. His research purported to demonstrate the inferiority of Gypsies by claiming that they are socially unproductive; moreover, due to their biologically inherited mental deficiency, they are a burden on the state budget, thus requiring public resources for assistance in medical or welfare institutions. This way, eugenic research as a main stance had both economic and racial arguments for "scien-

¹⁴ Willems (1997) found that 4,577 titles of publications about Gypsies were mentioned in a selective bibliography from 1914.

tifically” justifying the economic benefits of a genocidal politics against Gypsies (Willems 1997). Economic suggestions of nineteenth-century scholars to frame Gypsies as a potential productive force that the society should use have been taken and reinterpreted by Nazi scientists in the context of the economic crisis preceding the Second World War, as an argument for the physical elimination of Gypsies, seen as a parasitic group of people that are consumers of limited societal resources to which they are not contributors. It seems to be a continuity in the ways of framing Roma in economic terms in all historical periods, since their early fiscal categorization as slaves in Romanian principalities in the Middle Ages (analyzed in Chapter 4), to their contemporary consideration as a welfare dependent group in some policy studies¹⁵ (which perpetuates the very distant and recurring standpoints made by academic and amateur scholars in the past), or to their reinvention as a potential economic investment for governments (World Bank 2010, 2011). This theme of the economic (un)productivity of Gypsies/Roma appears therefore in the most diverse policy regimes, from national socialism, to communism, and more recently to neoliberalism, with its renewed interest in making the labor force more efficient by various Roma-targeted projects (and not by creating jobs).

*Anthropological views on Roma origin:
Exoticization and irrelevance*

In constituting Gypsies/Roma as an object of study, social and cultural anthropologists often claim to have a privileged position due to their use of methods and techniques of research that are more suitable than, for example, those employed by sociologists. Qualitative research based on participant observation and unstructured interviews is considered by anthropologists to offer a more thorough and detailed, and ultimately deeper understanding of Roma identity than would be possible using quantitative techniques, such as surveys, based on more or less representative samples. Moreover, questionnaire surveys are con-

¹⁵ See, for example, the UNDP (2002) study, which portrays Roma as a welfare dependent group. In the 85 pages of the report the word “dependency” and its derivatives (dependence, dependent) appear more than fifty times and “dependency culture(s)” related with Roma appears eleven times.

sidered to be misleading and misrepresenting the object of study due to, *inter alia*, biased sampling, questions framed in a way that does not acknowledge meanings specific to the local context, and the tendency of subjects to give field operators desirable answers. Anthropologists argue that participant observation in Roma communities for longer periods of time, combined with the use of information from historical documents, could offer deeper understandings of Roma identity and, more importantly, knowledge from the “inside”—a type of knowledge less prone to questionable generalizations than what is acquired through quantitative research. Nevertheless, knowledge gained by anthropologists through participant observation (as external actors only temporarily inserted in the communities they study) is often seen as firsthand information, although it is at best second rank or even more distant: “In short, anthropological writings are themselves interpretations; and second and third order ones to boot. (By definition, only a ‘native’ makes first order ones: it’s *his* culture.)” (Geertz 1973, 16; emphasis in the original).

Behind the pros and cons of the different methodological approaches, classifications, and descriptions of Gypsies/Roma, social and cultural anthropology provides the most abundant scientific accounts that frame the group in the subfield of Gypsy Studies (or Romani Studies after 1990). Within anthropology, Stewart (2013) identifies three competing explanations for the social formation of Gypsies/Roma: the historical explanation, focused on Roma foreign (Indian) origin; the socio-structural model, preoccupied with labeling in the processes of group formation; and the culturalist explanation, centered around performative and situational aspects of Roma identity.

The standard reference for the historical perspective is the founding father of Gypsology, Heinrich Moritz Gottlieb Grellmann, whose book *Zigeuner* (1783) saw numerous editions and translations. Grellmann’s narrative of “Gipseys” claims that Roma, due to their “true” Indian origin, are essentially different from their European neighbors. According to Willems (1997), the book of Grellmann inspired Gypsy Studies scholars, many of whom grouped around the Gypsy Lore Society. A central preoccupation of studies in Gypsology, especially those with historical depth, was to stabilize the epistemological object under scrutiny. For most of the twentieth century, this was done by measurement, description, classification, and recording the

sequential history of events of the encounters between Gypsies and the state. The journal *Romani Studies*, established in 2000 as the heir of the *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, acknowledges both the continuity of ethnological tradition and the departure from it by accepting multiple perspectives and making room for critical inquiries. Critical accounts vis-à-vis the classical paradigm in Gypsy Studies started in the 1980s and eventually proliferated after 1990, when essentialist narratives of Gypsy/Roma came under close scrutiny by cultural anthropologists, media studies scholars, and social historians.

What is a continuous line in the anthropological perspective of the conceptualization of Gypsies/Roma as a group that traversed history, is that they preserved intact, or with little alteration, some important characteristics of the ethnic group. The distinction between the different standpoints of the social anthropologists is the degree of *ethnic closure* (in the Weberian sense) that they admit, as well as what they accept or reject as specific cultural traits for Gypsies/Roma. In this regard, there are anthropologists who are keen on conceptualizing Gypsies/Roma as a closed ethnic group, sharing to various degrees all the characteristics which satisfy the internal criteria of group consistency, while other anthropologists are more open to the constructivist position, nevertheless adhering to some essentialist claims. In what follows, I briefly review some of the most influential anthropological publications on Gypsies/Roma.

Although addressing mainly the context of the United Kingdom, Okely's book (1983), *The Travellers-Gypsies*, has larger potential implications for understanding more broadly the Roma categorization process. The book is highly influential, having numerous citations and republished in eight editions since 1983. The publication became famous, and it is often cited for being among the first publications that challenged the theory of Roma's Indian origin. The main thesis of the book is that the historical documents about Gypsies/Travellers should be read with circumspection and caution because these sources represent merely the viewpoints of an elite unrelated to Gypsies, bound to a specific time, context, and official institutional affiliation (legislator, government). Instead, these official sources are more useful for understanding the changes in the categorization of Gypsies/Travellers, and rather should be seen as fertile documents for interpretation than objective descriptions of the group. Another important claim of

the book is that the official sources as well as the flourishing literature about Gypsies starting with the nineteenth century have an interest in the exoticization of the group (Okely 1983).

Affirming the Indian origin of Gypsies merely responds to a societal need to make the difference tolerable through exoticization: "Today, the extent to which Indian origin is emphasised depends on the extent to which the groups or individuals are exoticised and, paradoxically, considered acceptable to the dominant society" (Okely 1983, 2). The Indian origin of Gypsies is currently supposed to be a widely acknowledged academic and political artifact, similar to the Egyptian origin of Gypsies that was used in scholarly accounts before, for more than two centuries, although the Indian origin seems to be largely irrelevant for those defined as Gypsies: "Paradoxically, there is very little evidence that Indian origin had been indicated or used by Gypsies until it was first given to them by Gorgio [non-Roma] scholars. Even today the title 'Romany' is not generally interpreted at the local level as of Indian origin" (Okely 1983, 12). In fact, Gypsies have various indigenous origins and they cannot be reduced just to an Indian or Egyptian origin: with the transition from feudalism to capitalism, people who did not adapt to the wage system of work and instead chose to practice itinerant occupations were labeled as Gypsies and conferred an exotic origin (*ibid.*).

Another challenge for the orthodoxy of Gypsy Studies is related to the perceived degree of isolation of the Gypsies/Travellers group. Far from being a cultural or social isolate, Gypsies maintain close relations with broader society, and their itinerant occupations are complementing the needs of society (*ibid.*). Moreover, Gypsy groups are not endogamous—i.e., with marriages occurring predominantly inside their own group (Okely 1983; Fraser 1992; Achim 2004)—as many studies about Gypsies portray, but on the contrary, marriages with people who are not part of the group are relatively common.

Biological determinism, assumed by scholars in Gypsy/Romani Studies who equated the knowledge of the Romani language with a specific racial type given by a common and single origin and by genetic inheritance, is criticized by Okely, who notes that the language is a matter of learning and not one of biological descent: "Language has been equated by the Gypsiologists with 'race.' It has been implied by some that those Gypsies who use the most Romani words (whether or not these have traceable Sanskrit 'roots') have the closest genetic

links with India. The underlying assumption is that language is transmitted or learnt only through biological descent" (1983, 8). While all the above points suggest in theory a strong constructivist perspective, in fact, Okely assumes her own version of ethnic groupness of Gypsies/ Travellers related with their lifestyle, giving preference to a peripatetic existence and self-employment; this point was acknowledged by Mayall (2004) as well.

A relatively similar perspective in regard to the exoticization of Gypsies/Roma is brought by Stewart (1997), who analyzed a Roma community in Hungary by participant observation for eighteen months. His book, *The Time of the Gypsies*, is highly cited in Romani Studies and connected fields. Commenting on the relevance of Okely's theory of Gypsies as locals in the society of the UK, as opposed to the outsider status given to them by other Gypsy/Romani Studies scholars, Stewart notes two conclusions that apply to Eastern European Gypsies as well: "First, talk of Indian origin unnecessarily exoticizes the Gypsies, and second, it ignores their own view of themselves. For the fact is that most nonintellectual Rom do not seem to care where their ancestors come from" (1997, 28). For most Roma, the meaning of ethnicity is not something that is inherited but that is made and performed in relation to the community and in opposition to the outsiders of the community. Roma ethnicity seems to be merely an issue that has relevance for Gypsy intellectuals who are involved in identity politics, and has no significance for people at the grassroots level. For Roma, boundaries of the group seem not to be ethnically defined and in any case not inherited, since inside Roma communities often there are non-Roma people who are accepted as part of the group (Stewart 1997). What creates connectedness among Roma is not a distant past or an ethnic origin, but the fact of speaking the Romani language and of performing *hic et nunc*, a Roma identity in the way of thinking and acting. In this regard, people leaving Roma communities for a long time and coming back to these communities sometimes have trouble in being recognized and readmitted as members of the Roma group. Leaving the community or living differently than communal norms may disqualify people from being recognized and accepted as Roma:

. . . the construction the construction of Gypsy identity as something that could be acquired *and could therefore also be lost*. It was

not enough to be born to a Gypsy family—one had to continually reaffirm this identity by participating in activity together, by doing things in a similar manner, by actively displaying one's continuing attachment to the Gypsy way of doing things. (Stewart 1997, 92; emphasis in the original)

What is important in the anthropological views that I briefly mentioned above is the understanding of Roma identity as not being bounded by a common and shared origin, but by the current cultural practices developed in Roma communities (in relationship with the nearby non-Roma communities), including the usage of the Romani language. However, through the insistence that the Roma customs and traditions were maintained unaltered through time, and that cultural hybridity¹⁶ may have little space in the way Roma are thinking and acting, the cultural and social anthropological perspectives may relegate Roma to a cultural determinism, even if it replaces the more pernicious biological determinism which was prevailing for a long time in Romani Studies. The intensification of cultural exchanges in recent history under the marks of globalization makes cultures increasingly fused, which consequently leads to the fact that pure or independent cultures are no longer a reality: "In our world, no culture is an island" (Burke 2013, 102). Under these circumstances, describing Roma as an autonomous and homogenous culture does not account for the cultural dynamics in contemporary global society.

3. ROMA IDENTITY BETWEEN ACTIVISM AND POLITICS

While social historians argue for the constructed character of Roma ethnicity, at the crossroad of academic and governmental practices, political scientists put the focus on social movements as an important framer of Roma identity. Addressing Roma activism as a phenomenon revived after 1990, the approach of political scientists is less historical but more centered along decomposing the salient frames of political actors that produce discourse on Roma and that are active in policy-

¹⁶ For an analysis of the concept of "cultural hybridity," see Burke (2013).

making. Political scientists aim to highlight the interplay between political discourse and that of Roma activists, and to explain how Roma identity emerges as a result of these two types of intersected discourse and categorizations. One of their main questions seems to be related to who the actors are that contributed most to the institutionalization of the Roma category in discourse and policies. In this regard, three main lines adopted by political scientists can be discerned. The first line argues that the institutionalization of Roma category occurred mainly as an effect of political organizations enacting discourse and policies. The second set of authors (as I will show further on) argue that Roma as an umbrella category, as it is currently used, is the result of the interaction between the political establishment and the emerging Roma movement, as embodied in Roma organizations and individual activists. The third perspective concentrates predominantly on the role played by the Roma movement in the institutionalization of Roma as an encompassing political category. Of course, the differences among these three types of accounts are rather nuanced than substantial.

Representative of the first line of explanation in regard to the emerging Roma identity is the article by Simhandl (2006), which highlights the predominant role played by political institutions in Roma categorization. The main focus of her analysis is the EU institutions, such as the European Commission and the European Parliament, as well as their discourse on Roma that was codified over time in official policy documents. In arguing that Roma are conceived as a political category, Simhandl (2006) explores the discourse of EU political institutions for more than four decades and explains the creation of political objects such as Roma, Travellers, and Gypsies through the very discourse of these institutions answering to circumstantial political agendas. The essentialism of the EU political discourse on Roma is reflected in its main functions and especially in those of naming, classifying, and numbering (Simhandl 2006). The construction of the political category of Roma began in the 1970s, when those seen as part of the group were labeled in Western Europe as nomads, then as “people with no fixed abode,” or travellers, and after 1990 they were re-categorized together with their Eastern counterparts into categories such as “disadvantaged group and ethnic minority” and still fell short of being considered as “national” minorities (*ibid.*). Inconsistencies in the categorization of Roma in EU political discourse over time do not

impede the preservation of this discourse even when conceptually and terminologically the reference to Roma as a political object gains a new meaning:

In general, the discourse is characterised more by discontinuity than continuity. Under the second interpretative pattern, which conceives of ‘Gypsies,’ ‘Roma,’ and the EU Roma as a minority in Eastern Europe, there is no reference to be found to the first phase at all. The terminological continuity is broken; ‘nomadism’ ceases to be a point of reference; the dimension of culture (a specific ‘gypsy culture’), present, although not dominant, under the first interpretative pattern, also vanishes. The two interpretative patterns are kept strictly separate. The geographical association of Roma issues with Eastern Europe serves to uphold the separation of ‘Eastern Roma’ and ‘Western Gypsies and Travellers,’ allowing the establishment of ‘Roma’ as a category that refers exclusively to ‘the East.’ This separation is the precondition for portraying ‘Eastern Roma’ as obstacles to EU Enlargement (Simhandl 2006, 109–110).

Simhandl’s (2006) conclusion is that coining the term Roma and applying it to the ethnicization of certain segments of the Eastern European population by Western institutions is a typical example of the orientalization of the East.

The second line of explanation is illustrated by Klímová-Alexander (2005) who suggests that Roma as a political category is the result of the interaction between Roma activists and organizations, and various branches of the United Nations (UN). While Simhandl (2006) argues the important role played by the EU institutions in the categorization of Roma, Klímová-Alexander (2005) focuses on the role of the UN in addition to the Roma activists. She acknowledges the role played by the International Romani Union (IRU) since the 1970s in searching to obtain the recognition as an organization representing Roma worldwide and to gain a consultative status within the UN system. In this process of building legitimacy and recognition with the UN, activists associated with IRU have had to use the possibilities allowed by the UN in order to advance their position as a representative organization for Roma and to advocate collective rights for Roma. In purporting to represent Roma

and to obtain a legitimate position with the UN, at times IRU had to prove itself useful for the different branches of the UN by providing knowledge and opinions about Roma in different official contexts, such as public speeches and presentations, as well as commenting on UN proposals for issuing various policy documents.

With these interactions between Roma activists and UN officials and institutions, the frames in which Roma were described and categorized have developed over time mutually influencing one another (Klímová-Alexander (2005). In this regard, the political and administrative categories used by the UN, such as that of “national minority” and “native or indigenous population,” were used as frames to be applied to Roma; gradually, these were codified in the political and administrative discourse as an umbrella category for a variety of groups defined in linguistic, geographic, cultural, occupational, and social terms. Since the interests of the IRU were related with representing Roma as a nation, in order to advance with these claims, activists had to comply with the political, legal, and administrative categories in use within the UN system. In the institutionalization of the Roma category as a political classification of diverse groups, the contribution of IRU and their relation with the UN system was instrumental. Klímová-Alexander clarifies the current understanding and extension of the term Roma as a mainly political and partially academic construction:

“Roma” is a political term used as an umbrella name for all members of the Romani ethnic community. Its usage in political, and, sometimes, academic discourse (by both Roma and non-Roma) demonstrates a strong tendency towards treating the extremely ethnographically diverse Romani community or communities as a largely homogeneous group, overshadowing the various appellations preferred by the individual groups and subgroups. (2005, 13)

Two uses of the term Roma can be distinguished: a broader political classification that uses the term Roma as a category, which brings together different and potentially unrelated groups and individuals; and (2) a more narrow use of the term to describe an ethno-linguistic community, or those who speak the Romani language (*ibid.*). From the many groups and individuals politically categorized as Roma, just a rel-

atively small segment is using the term Roma as an ethnonym (self-appellation of Romani language speakers). However, there are many other ethnonyms (e.g., Egyptians, Ashkali, Rudari, Boyash) in use that have not gained similar political recognition.

The third perspective puts more weight on the role played by the Roma movement, independent of the role of the institutions. In this perspective, the accent is placed on the Roma intellectuals, activists, and organizations (notable IRU and European Roma and Travellers Forum) as principal actors in imposing Roma nationalism and, together with it, the term Roma as a political category in policy discourse and policy-making. Kovats (2003, 2013) considers the Roma movement to be the main development in the institutionalization of Roma as an encompassing policy-making category. Although Roma identity is framed by outside, powerful institutions, nevertheless, Roma organizations are instrumental and successful in imposing an acknowledgment of Roma identity in political circles. Roma identity is highly politicized by the promoters of Roma nationalism, and the internal criteria of group unity are rather politically and socially constructed than empirical facts. In this regard, none of the criteria in which nations or ethnic groups are currently conceived are fully applicable to Roma as a group all over Europe, with a size of 8–10 million people (Kovats 2003, 2013). Linguistically, the speakers of Romani are estimated to be around one quarter of the number advocated as the size of the group by Roma activists and EU institutions, and moreover, the dialects spoken by Roma people from different countries are mutually unintelligible. In regard to the linguistic community of Romani speakers, Kovats notes: “The most commonly cited thread is the Sanskrit-based language *Romanes* which linguists argue indicates a common origin of Romani people. Whatever the language does indicate, *Romanes* today is spoken by only around 2.5 million of the putative 8–10 million-strong European Romani diaspora...” (2001, 97). Beyond the language issue, Kovats (2003, 2013) reminds us that those labeled as Roma share all the major religious denominations of their countries and do not follow a particular form of spirituality tied only to them. Certain cultural practices, such as purity rituals, are rather isolated and not common for all labeled as Roma, and moreover are also shared by some other people or communities (Kovats 2013). The same applies to occupations and lifestyles, including itinerancy, which are very diverse and are not specific

to Roma. Roma cannot be limited to a single ‘racial type’ and, albeit in some cases they have a distinct physiognomy (e.g., darker skin), not all those labeled as Roma have the appearance of a dark complexion. Moreover, some Roma have a physical appearance similar to that of non-Roma, and this last category also includes people who share a supposedly specific Roma appearance (*ibid.*). More importantly, although self-ascription supposedly increased during the last years as a result of Roma activism, those who self-declare as Roma are in a minority compared with those estimated by politicians and activists to be part of the group. Ethnicization and racialization of “Roma issues” represents a convenient way for authorities to deliver minor cultural services, establish Roma-related organizations, and promote a few Roma political leaders, rather than addressing more serious issues related to structural socio-economic inequalities in European societies:

... authorities have found it easier to promote Roma cultural “differences” and separate political representation, civil organizations, Roma experts and advisors. In this way, the formal integration of Roma individuals/organisations and identity into mainstream politics can be achieved at the expense of the integration of “Roma” people into the mainstream economy and society. (Kovats 2013, 123)

Another political scientist who gives a prominent role to the Roma movement for the construction of Roma transnational identity is Vermeersch (2005). In analyzing the Roma movement and its options in the advocacy activities for recognition of the group in the political sphere, he distinguishes between visions of mobilization of different Roma activist groups and mobilization frames (in terms of minority rights and multiculturalism) of international organizations. Roma movement activists, by their engagement with various political actors, are bounded to represent Roma identity in very stigmatized terms, in order to gain the attention of political actors and donors. Contrary to the aim of presenting a positive image of Roma that would be able to create larger premises for social solidarity, the attempts to frame Roma as a unitary transnational group sharing common identity markers (such as common descent, language, and culture) and having the same problems (poverty, unemployment, etc.), are rather conducive to the

reinforcement of widely held stereotypical beliefs (Vermeersch 2005). As a consequence, the replacement of the pejorative term Gypsy with the new label of Roma does not change or challenge a negative representation at societal level, but continues to produce images of the group as one composed of marginalized and excluded outsiders. Through their activity in voicing the rights of Roma as a transnational minority in various political forums, Roma activists have few options but to reinforce a stigmatized identity and deepen the already existing cleavages between Roma groups and others:

[Roma activists] run the risk of reifying, politicizing, and perhaps even intensifying the boundary between minority and majority identities. A simplified reification of the Roma as a coherent and clearly identifiable group with common attributes (such as economic marginality, common culture, common descent, specific traits, a single ethnic identity, and so on) not only misses the power to mobilize people in a unified movement, but it also fails to overcome the powerful negative valuations of Romani identity that are present in society at large. (Vermeersch 2005, 454)

Beyond individual consequences of a stigmatized identity for those labeled as Roma, the danger of essentializing Roma identity by Roma activists and international organizations is that if in the medium term the problems associated with a monolithic and transnational Roma group (such as poverty, unemployment, segregation, precarious housing, poor health, etc.) are not solved by the targeted Roma programs, the failure would be attributed to the Roma group itself (*ibid.*).

In representing the Roma population, Roma activists employed mainly two types of framing strategies: “identity framing,” as a form of collective identity containing its boundaries, and the “problem framing,” which is almost similar to the concept of “problem definition” from policy analysis (Vermeersch 2006). However, the different groups within the Roma movement use different frames: the dominant group within the Roma movement advances *ethnic discrimination* as the strategic frame for conceptualizing the Roma population. In light of this frame and in spite of how Roma may view themselves, they are presented and viewed by many Roma activists as being connected to each other by a “shared experience of discrimination” (Vermeersch

2006, 151). The problems that Roma are confronted with (such as poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, and ill health) are considered “by-products of discrimination” (ibid., 151). Roma political leaders consider discrimination as intentional and deliberate, and their main focus in regard to the Roma movement was that of opposing discrimination. There is a smaller number of activists who deem the current socioeconomic status more relevant than ethnicity for framing the Roma population, and therefore they attach less importance to discrimination and shared ethnicity (ibid.). However, this socio-economic frame, which is stressing poverty and, consequently, Roma inadequate answers to the problems they face, is understood by many Roma activists as stigmatizing. The main frames used by the Roma movement to build an ethnic identity are problematic for mobilizing large segments of the population because these specific frames put a stigma on those attempting to unite together: “The more they [Roma] emphasized their ethnic identity, the more they appeared to be held responsible for what was typically called the ‘Romani problem.’ ... How is one to build a movement on what is regarded by many as a ‘stigmatized’ identity?” (Vermeersch 2006, 182).

To sum up, political scientists who analyze Roma ethnicity agree on its political construction from above. Roma ethnicity is mainly built by common work and interventions of powerful supranational political bodies, international organizations, governments, and social movements such as the Roma movement. Although those political entities have different roles in terms of their importance for the construction of Roma ethnicity, political analysts agree on the fact that this ethnicity is rather the result of an external construction than of a mobilization coming from the grassroots. Even though sometimes the frames of international organizations and those of governments seemed to clash, due to the current Europeanization of the Roma issue there is a convergence of the political framers’ standpoints.

4. STUDIES ON ROMA DISCRIMINATION

After the Second World War the persecution and discrimination of Roma received little attention from scholars and international organizations (Sigona and Trehan 2009). Roma discrimination studies

saliently emerged after 1990, when Roma were acknowledged as an ethnic and national minority in countries from Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) concomitantly with the enlargement of the European Union. As one of the requirements for CEE countries for becoming a member of the European Union was the protection of minorities, country reports about the situation of minorities started to acknowledge huge discrepancies in the living conditions and life chances between the Roma minority and majority populations. In the last two decades, past and current discrimination, exclusion, and marginalization of Roma have been increasingly researched in all European countries with a Roma minority, especially in the fields of education, health, employment, and housing.

Discrimination studies were published not only by scholars, but also by international organizations, such as the ERRC (European Roma Rights Centre), FRA (European Agency for Fundamental Rights), CoE (Council of Europe), UNICEF, OSF (Open Society Foundations), Amnesty International, and Roma Education Fund (REF), amongst others. Research on Roma poverty in CEE countries also addresses the issue of discrimination as one prominent factor in the overall picture of inequality between Roma and majority populations. These studies position Roma as a disadvantaged and vulnerable group on the fringe of society (e.g., World Bank 2000, 2002, 2005; UNDP 2002, 2005, 2006a).

Discrimination against Roma in relation to housing is a complex phenomenon that encompasses an increasing ghettoization of Roma neighbourhoods, although not all compact Roma communities are poor or have substandard living conditions (Vincze and Raţ 2013; Berescu 2013). A series of studies illustrates a lack of basic infrastructure (e.g., running water, sewage system, electricity) in some segregated Roma communities, poor access to social housing and forced evictions (ERRC 2011, 2012; Rughiniş 2004; Zoon 2001), segregated and substandard housing in authorized camps “for nomads” in Italy (Amnesty International 2013; ERRC 2000; Sigona 2005), a lack of halting sites and a prohibition to camp in countries with Traveller communities (FRA 2009b).

In the field of education, studies underline the segregation of large segments of Roma pupils in classes and schools with substandard educational facilities and a higher proportion of unqualified teachers,

as well as the channelling of Roma pupils in schools for people with mental disability and low prospects for further education or employment (ERRC 2004; Greenberg 2010; OSI 2007; REF 2009; Surdu 2002, Surdu and Friedman 2013; UNICEF 2007). In relation to health, studies are documenting poor access to healthcare, including emergency services, denial of treatment for Roma patients, provision of inferior services and segregation of Roma patients in hospitals, especially women and children in maternity units (CoE and EUMC 2003; ERRC 2006; Földes and Covaci 2012; OSF 2013; Zoon 2001).

The transition of CEE countries from socialist centralized economies to capitalism brought about very high unemployment for Roma, who previously had comparable employment levels with non-Roma (Bárány 2001; Guy 2001; Sigona and Trehan 2009). Studies and policy reports after 1990 found that on the labor market Roma experience significant discrimination in the job recruitment process, they receive lower wages, they occupy jobs under their formal qualifications, and many of their jobs are in the informal market (ERRC 2007; FRA 2009a; Milcher and Fischer 2011; REF and Gallup 2009; UNDP 2012). In some cases, jobs for university-educated Roma are exclusively tied to positions associated with Roma ethnicity (e.g., social workers and teachers working only with Roma families and children, or governmental advisers on Roma-specific topics). This exclusive occupational niche signifies Roma marginalization and exclusion from the mainstream labor market (ERRC 2007). A UNDP (2012) survey on twelve countries in Central and Southeast Europe confirmed a consistent gap in employment and wages between Roma and non-Roma (with larger differences for Roma women), which is not attributable to education or experience. Scholars employ the concepts of multiple discrimination and intersectionality for an understanding of the role played by class, gender, and ethnicity in determining patterns of prejudice against Roma women and their discriminatory outcomes (Vincze 2006; Kóczé and Popa 2009; Surdu and Surdu 2006).

During the 1990s, Roma-related discrimination studies covered mainly the countries in CEE, while after 2000, countries from Western Europe were also brought into focus, especially in the context of recent migration from CEE towards Western Europe. Migration occasioned by the advance of the European unification project contributed to increased political attention toward the “Roma issue” and the ethnici-

zation of social problems in political and policy-making discourse. The fears of Roma migration to the “West,” together with an encouragement of economic migration to the “East,” were politically appropriated and heightened. Ethnicized discourses of “the Roma issue” and “Roma migration” were amplified by regular mass media campaigns which led to increasing levels of societal prejudices against Roma and enhancing social distance between Roma and non-Roma.¹⁷ The unification of Europe brings a collective identity by which Roma are conceived as an ethnic group, epitomizing general social problems by an increasing racialization of Roma (Balibar 2009, 2011; Kovats 2003, 2013).

The current social, economic, and political context of the Roma people’s situation in Europe is shaped by the growing marginalization and pauperization of Roma in CEE countries, deportations and evictions of migrant Roma from Western Europe, hate speech about Roma performed by politicians across the political spectrum, the popularity of extreme right parties, and violence against Roma in several places in Europe. It is in this context that the ‘Roma issue’ is elevated to a European level, which is a fact acknowledged by political initiatives such as the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies, adopted in 2011. Critical analyses argue that each of the recent anti-discrimination initiatives fail to challenge the structural causes of the socio-economic decline of Roma from a relatively well adapted group in socialist economies to a pauperized one in the current capitalist economies of CEE (Kovats 2003; Sigona and Trehan 2009; Templer 2006). Matras (2014) suggests that targeted programs on Roma that started after the 1990s could do more harm than good as they paradoxically increase the isolation and segregation of Roma, while Gheorghe (2013) stresses that the victimization of the group prevents civic mobilization and additionally could raise the hostility of the broader society, which may perceive these targeted interventions as inefficient spending of public resources during an economic crisis.

As a tentative conclusion, the ethnic category of Gypsies/Roma appears to be constructed through the systematic study for over two centuries by different communities of academic and non-academic

¹⁷ This fact is exemplified by Eurobarometers 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2012.

practices. Even inside a single community, such as the academic community, classifications of Gypsies/Roma have been elaborated by various scientific disciplines (ethnology, anthropology, sociology, political sciences, public policies, history, and genetics). Moreover, within these specific scientific subfields, the classification of Gypsies varies according to the distinct approaches of each subfield, as for example is the case in cultural anthropology, which examines the customs and traditions of Gypsies, or that of physical anthropology (or anthropometry), which inquires about Gypsies through external markers of the body. As each of the particular subfields of the social sciences and humanities has its own privileged approaches and methods, the interest of scholars was primarily oriented to circumscribe the Gypsies/Roma category to their specific field of knowledge and to define them according to the particular paradigms that are foundational for their fields. Therefore, the understanding of Gypsies/Roma pertains to different registers of classification in the academic community: they are made visible by using taxonomies, definitions, and meanings that privilege a particular type of scientific culture attached to a specific field of study. Nevertheless, by mutual borrowings and knowledge transfers between research traditions, and under the impulse of policy-oriented research during recent history, an overlap of perspectives emerged, conducive towards a common framing of Gypsies/Roma and resulted in a shared stereotypical image of the group.

Chapter 4

Ethnicity Inscriptions in Censuses and Surveys

“The mystique of science proclaims that numbers are the ultimate test of objectivity.”

(Stephen Jay Gould)

“The survey is to view something from a commanding position.”

(Peter Burke)

“... it is naïve to accept numbers as accurate, without examining who is using them and why.”

(Joel Best)

Applied sociology and the administrative practice of the census consider ethnicity as a measurable and objective reality. The census is a solid administrative practice through which social science methodologies create and fix ethnicity by generating ethnic data for the use of discourse and political action. For ethnic categories to become ethnic groups and integrated into official discourse (administrative, academic, journalistic, and political), these categories should be first defined, processed (hence manipulated), counted, and circulated as statistical data resulting from the census. Elaboration of ethnic categories by census experts always has a degree of arbitrariness that is reflected first in the construction and selection of ethnic labels, and

second in the relationships among them. Ethnic categories could be measured either as disjunctive (i.e., one can stay in a category but not in another) or as continuous (i.e., one can stay in multiple categories). However, after the gathering and processing of the census data, the initial arbitrariness related to the construction of the categories and the myriad of decisions related to data gathering appears post-factum as an objective reality, after having passed scientific checking procedures and, more importantly, after being legitimated by governmental statistical offices.

The census is a generative matrix of scientific facts, as for example the ethnic, religious, or occupational structure of a society. The notion of an *inscription device*¹ is useful for the description of the census in relation to ethnicity (as well as to other variables) as a scientific and administrative procedure that *assembles* technologies and techniques, such as statistical software (replacing the tabulating machines), guidelines and manuals for interview application, a list of definitions and codification of answers or observations, questionnaires, and concepts for media campaigns. The guided conversations and observations that take place during the data gathering process are transformed through inscription procedures into statistical data by networks of professionals (demographers, statisticians, economists, sociologists). Useful for understanding the census as an inscription device are the examples of data collection that have extreme consequences in that the ethnic/racial categories created through the administrative and scientific exercise become so deeply objectified that the ethnic/racial markers derived from the census were further considered as selection criteria in policies of exclusion and discrimination. The censuses from the National Socialist period in Germany and the administrative records in apartheid South Africa are two examples in which the classification of ethnicity/race by administrative and scientific means had devastating consequences for the lives of those so classified.

¹ For the term “inscription device,” see Latour and Woolgar (1986). For census bureaus as centers of calculation that sediment scientific-expert knowledge and transport them from peripheries to the center, see Latour (1987).

1. THE CENSUS IN RACIAL POLICY REGIMES

The Census in Nazi Germany

In the interwar period computing technologies (punch card machines) were developed by the International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) with previously unseen precision and speed. IBM tabulating equipment was imported to Europe and served to compile records and process personal information of large segments of the populations. During the Nazi regime in Germany, this comprehensive and mechanized exercise of the census was instrumental for singling out Jews, Roma, and other “foreigners,” perceived as deviants and enemies of the Third Reich, selecting them for evacuation, forced labor, deportation, and finally contributing to their extermination (Aly and Roth 2004). Yet, it was not only Germany that set the tone for the mechanistic and complete registration of personal information, including ethnicity, but this path of registering the population was influential for other European countries: the Nazi census expert Friedrich Burgdörfer, for example, supervised and praised the Romanian censuses from the interwar period (Achim 2005).

Data collection through census and other administrative records in Nazi Germany was raised to unprecedented levels:

Never before or since in Germany have so many evaluations been written and so much data collected about people than during those twelve years [1933–1945]. The methods used can be described as both bureaucratic and scientific. Characteristic to both methods is the abstraction of individuals: the person becomes a case, an example, an index card. (Aly and Roth 2004, 23)

The fervor of data collection and the correlation of diverse sources of data in order to locate the victims by the Nazi authorities was materialized in a tremendous increase of the institutions gathering racial data: the Racial Policy Bureau (RPA), the Reich Office for Genealogical Research, the Protestant churches in Berlin, the Reich Health Office, the Reich Central Office for the Fight against the Gypsy Plague, and the Eugenic and Demographic Biology Research Unit (Luebke and

Milton 1994). All these institutions assigned to collecting data complemented the censuses that took place successively in a short period of time, the first one in 1933 and the second in 1939. The censuses were a political priority for Nazi governments and were among the first actions undertaken after they took power, and became activities invested in with important financial and human resources. Both censuses were part of an industrious process of making the collection and processing of data efficient with the help of the latest computing technologies: "In terms of technique and personnel the second Nazi census of May 17, 1939, was an even grander affair than the 1933 census. The muster of census-takers increased 50% to 750,000, who, as a result of the territorial annexation of 1938, now also included Austrians" (Luebke and Milton 1994, 28). One of the reasons for realizing a new census in 1939, only six years after the previous one, was to enhance the precision in locating the victims targeted by Nazis through additional items in the census questionnaire. Whether the census in 1933 registered Jews by religious observance, the promulgation of the racial definitions of the Nuremberg laws in 1935 made it possible to measure Jewishness in the census through ancestry.

According to the racial ideology, in addition to the census mechanism of registering Roma, similarly to Jews, were assigned different marking letters in a mandatory system of registration (*Volkskartei*) that complemented the census. This system of recording notations carved distinctions along a continuum, in which Z (from *Zigeuner*) designated full "Gypsy blood," ZM together with operators such as + and -, indicated mixed blood (predominantly Gypsy or German), while on the other end of the continuum NZ (*Nichtzigeuner*) indicated "German blood" (Aly and Roth 2004, 50). In the case of Gypsies, whose racialization was even stricter than that of Jews, in line with the Nazi ideology of racial purity, they were considered a racial threat. In this regard, the classification rule for Gypsies was that "if two of a person's eight great-grandparents were even part-Gypsy, that person had too much Gypsy ancestry to be allowed, later, to live" (Hancock 1987, 64).

Beyond the nominal registration of personal data in various administrative records (including church registries), the apparently neutral and inoffensive general census data proved to be harmful for those registered. Even data at an aggregate level (percentages), or so to speak statistical data that censuses provide, played a role in locating the vic-

tims, as the Nazi central authorities requested that local level authorities give a quota of Jews for deportation, established in accordance with the census results (Luebke and Milton 1994).

For their plans on the deportation of Gypsies in Transnistria during the Second World War, Romanian authorities appealed to detailed knowledge and analyses made by the Central Institute of Statistics,² although at the time when data were provided, deportations would have been already carried out; this is a fact which apparently excludes the involvement of the Institute in sorting victims for deportation.³ Nevertheless, Seltzer and Anderson (1994) include Romania and its census data collected from 1941 among the cases in which data systems were misused for human rights abuses against Jews and Roma. Beyond providing socio-demographic indicators at local or regional levels, the Romanian chief of the statistical office, Sabin Manuilă also offered to provide for the authorities nominal lists of Gypsies registered in the 1930 census, a collection of data that he considered more reliable than the 1941 census. Although this disclosure of data was eventually not concretized, since the partial deportation of Gypsies and Jews was realized before statistical expertise was compiled, nevertheless, the archival documents show that an offer in this regard had been made, which raises serious ethical and deontological concerns for those involved.

The complete surveillance of individuals put in practice by the Nazi bureaucracy and the consequences of the comprehensive registration of personal data, including medical records, could not have happened without the large and sometimes enthusiastic participation

² See archival documents (only in Romanian) no. 178 (pp. 296–297) and 207 (pp. 333–342) from the collection edited by Nastasă and Varga (2001). Document no. 178 is a report made by the general director of the Romanian Central Statistical Institute, Sabin Manuilă, for the Presidency of the Council of Ministers. This document states that the Institute could produce a nominal list of Gypsy families per locality together with indicators such as language, religion, occupations, and properties both for sedentary and nomadic Gypsies. Document no. 207 is a detailed statistical analysis of 1930 census data made by Sabin Manuilă for the military leader of the state, Ion Antonescu.

³ See, for example, Achim (2007) who based on the chronology of events excludes that the statistical compilation of Gypsy-related data provided by the Central Institute of Statistics might have helped deportation operations.

of the “scientific soldiers,” recruited from among various professionals (statisticians, medical doctors, geneticists), and without the support of the emerging technologies of information processing (Aly and Roth 2004). Without the administrative and scientific procedures of classification of Roma and Sinti, the persecution during the Nazi regime would not have been possible: “As yet the regime had still to determine who was a ‘Gypsy.’ Registering and classifying a group of victims was always a necessary precondition of their systematic persecution” (Burleigh and Wippermann 1991, 118). Racial science was the foundation for and legitimized the racial definitions codified in the Nuremberg Laws,⁴ and these pseudo-scientific grounds further assisted the extermination policies. There is no certitude that the tragic end could have happened in the absence of this support that “science” gave to the ruling class at that time (Willems 1997). After the Second World War, the concept of race as a fixed, natural, unchanging, objective, and quantifiable reality was challenged because of the tragic failure of previous attempts to quantify race.⁵ Yet, the concept of race is still in place as an objective category in censuses, research, and generally in the scientific literature, and its slow and partial replacement with that of ethnicity is in fact in many cases merely a continuation of racial thought under a new name. The way in which Gypsy/Roma ethnicity is approached today in the scientific literature (e.g., biologization of Roma in genetic research and their indirect racialization in policy papers) and in expert discussions about census practices (e.g., the issue of Gypsies’ under-declaration) shows that experts do not comprehend ethnicity as a sense of belonging, but as racialized.

The Census in apartheid South Africa

Another example of how the racial classification systems dramatically change people’s lives is brought by Bowker and Star (2002), who describe how the South African apartheid system (from 1950 until 1990) attached racial categories to individuals through various administrative records, including censuses. The apartheid system started as

⁴ See, for example, Weiss (2006, 2012).

⁵ See the 1950 UNESCO declaration on race.

a bureaucratic apparatus and ended with raising serious moral and ethical questions. The logic of the categorization process accomplished in South Africa under the apartheid regime is similar to that of “following orders” and of bureaucratic routine, culminating in systematic abuses and crimes during the National Socialist period in Germany and occupied countries of Europe. Bowker and Star describe technical and political classifications as two intertwined processes:

... classification systems are often sites of political and social struggles, but ... these sites are difficult to approach. Politically and socially charged agendas are often first presented as purely technical and they are difficult even to see. As layers of a classification system become enfolded into a working infrastructure, the original political intervention becomes more and more firmly entrenched. In many cases, this leads to a naturalization of the political category, through a process of convergence. It becomes taken for granted. (2002, 196)

The assiduous enterprise of racial and ethnic classification, and the enforcement of classifications in order to separate people in public contexts (school, work, leisure time) and matters of private life, as for example prohibiting marriages between persons officially sorted in different racial and ethnic categories, were justified by racial ideologies that were positively regarded by politicians and made to appear as normal and taken for granted with the help of mass media. Such racial ideologies based on pseudo-racial science affirmed that “races,” as objective entities and not merely abstract labels, should be separated, and a healthy development for each “race” can only happen in a completely segregated existence. According to this ideology, mixing people from different racial categories should be seen as unnatural, while the social norm should be the separation of races (Bowker and Star 2002).

In South Africa in 1950, two governmental acts (Population Registration Act and Group Areas Act) asked that “people be strictly classified by racial group, and that those classifications determine where they could live and work” (*ibid.*, 196). The racial classification divided people into four groups: Europeans, Asiatics, persons of mixed race or colored, and “natives” or “pure-blooded individuals of the Bantu race” (*idem*, 197). The Bantu classification was further subdivided in eight

main groups; the colored classification was also subdivided, partially by ethnic criteria. Based on the racial classification enforced by law, a system of deep segregation, numerous bans and limitations (related to interracial sexuality, education, marriage, and employment) were enacted and very sharply controlled by the police. The bureaucracy reached such a level that, for example, a South African categorized as black had to carry a pass book of fifty pages long. The racial categorization put in place by the apartheid government was often ambiguous, although it was the precision in classification that was followed with obstinacy:

Despite the legal requirement for certainty in race identification, however, this task was not to prove so easy. Many people do not conform to the typologies constructed under the law: especially people whose appearance differed from their assigned category, or who lived with those of another race, spoke a different language from the assigned group, or had some other historical deviation from the pure type. New laws and amendments were constantly debated and passed. (idem, 201)

The criteria to distinguish among races in the apartheid system of classification were descent or the so-called “blood.” But in reality, “blood” could not be a factor used as evidence, and instead “a mixed criteria of ‘appearance and general acceptance and repute’” was used in practice in order to distinguish between people (Bowker and Star 2002, 208). Appearance was assessed by visual observation, and together with measuring the reputation in social circles of the persons subjected to racial evaluations, these represented highly ambiguous and subjective criteria (ibid.).

The example of the racial system of classification in apartheid South Africa raises two important conclusions. First, classifications have little connection with real people, however complex and detailed the typologies constructed by the authorities were. Furthermore, racial and ethnic classifications are contradictory, ambiguous, absurd, crude, degrading, and inconsistent, and the laws enacting these classifications are mirroring them, whatever the multitude of regulations issued and however detailed these legal tools are supposed to be. Second, despite the arbitrariness and inconsistencies in racial classifications and in the

laws resulting from them, the classifications are dramatically and radically interfering with people's lives, including separating family members based on racial criteria. Beyond stigmatization and humiliation as a consequence of the classificatory processes in South Africa under apartheid, the life trajectories of those classified were dramatically disrupted.

The two examples above, that of National Socialist Germany and apartheid South Africa, are separated by time and geography but share some traits nevertheless. First, the pseudo-scientific ideologies of racial superiority were used as drivers for running the machineries of administrative data collection procedures. Second, racial and ethnic definitions were introduced through codification in the legal system, and concomitantly, they were introduced in censuses and other administrative records. More importantly, in racial policy regimes the institutionalization of racial categories through the use of inscription devices had an overwhelming impact on people's lives.

However, the examples above are not the only instances of data misuse in relation to ethnicity or religion. Seltzer and Anderson (1994) review no less than ten cases in different countries around the globe between 1933 and 1994 (plus the persecution of the Native Americans in the nineteenth century), for which there is documented evidence that censuses, population registries, and other administrative records were used in human rights abuses, resulting in forced migration and genocide. There is a general consensus that at least in one case, that of Japanese Americans, the confidentiality of censuses was not respected and their internment in camps during the Second World War was done by the disclosure of personal information from the census. In regard to Gypsies, different population statistics were used for locating the victims in the interwar period and during the Second World War in countries such as France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, and Romania (Seltzer and Anderson 1994; Seltzer 1998).

2. ETHNICITY INSCRIPTION IN MODERN CENSUSES

While the above examples of misuses of data collection in regard to ethnicity and race point to the negative consequences of classification practices related to human beings, another contentious aspect is that of the *ambiguity* of current ethnic classifications. This ambiguity is dem-

onstrated by the lack of consensus on the definition of ethnicity, as well as the issue of whether and how ethnicity could be reliably measured. That ethnicity lacks an agreed-upon definition is illustrated by the variability of census data collection practices: some countries in Europe, for example, collect certain types of ethnic data, while others do not. This indicates not only the lack of a definition, but also the lack of consensus about the desirability of elaborate ethnic statistics with the support of the state apparatus. In addition, the lack of consensus on ethnic statistics points out an ethical dimension as well. According to a 2007 study, from 42 countries of the Council of Europe (CoE) surveyed in the research, 22 countries collect data on ethnicity, 24 on religion, and 26 on mother tongue and other spoken languages (see Simon 2007). From these findings, it seems that some countries do not collect data on ethnicity (or on proxy measures which can be interpreted as ethnicity), while others do. In practical terms, the issue of whether to collect ethnic data marks a division among European countries in regard to the social desirability of such endeavor. The report shows that although 22 countries are collecting ethnic data, this number might be inflated by divergent understandings of what ethnicity is. While Western European countries insist on stressing ideas of nationality and citizenship in the definition of ethnicity in censuses, South European countries give prevalence to the affiliation with a specific cultural group. The divergence in understandings of ethnicity raises questions about the objectivity of ethnic data. Moreover, recording ethnicity in censuses also raises the question of who the relevant actors are that confer legitimacy and hence objectivity on the data—scientists or state bureaucrats?

Governmental practices of recording ethnicity in censuses

In census data collection, there are also notable exceptions to ethnic categorization, such as the case of France—a country which not only does not record ethnicity in the census, but also the collection of ethnic data is prohibited by law (Kertzer and Arel 2002). Yet, as shown in the previous chapter, Republican France asked Gypsies to carry special identity papers. On the other end of classificatory practices, the United States census not only records ethnicity and race, but also identification is made in exclusive racial categories, following the principle of

“hypodescent.” According to this principle, children from mixed marriages with one Afro-American parent are automatically and inevitably assigned as members of the ‘inferior’ group; hence, the census creates “a division that is closer to that between definitively defined and delimited castes” (Bourdieu and Waquant 1999, 46). The exclusivism of the US census was confronted by academics and by minority groups during the 1990s, but all that was obtained from challenging the census categories was allowing individuals to assign more than one racial category in the census list (for the 1999 census), and not record themselves as “multiracial” or stand outside of the provided categories. Ironically, those who chose the category “other” and wrote “black-white” were counted as black, while those who wrote “white-black” were counted as white (Lee 1993). An even more distrustful element of the 1990 US census procedure is that those who circled more racial categories were assigned to that category that was marked darker, more prominently with the pen (Williams 2005).

The censuses of ethnicity and race are both a scientific and political practice, and the two sides are hardly separable. As a political practice, the census reflects the dominant ideology existing at a given moment in a society. The fact that ethnicity measurement considerably diverges from state to state, and even within the same state its conceptualization differs under different political regimes, reveals that ethnicity is (scientifically) manufactured and not natural. Ethnic statistics and the methodologies used for defining ethnicity are always produced in particular political circumstances in order to be used by the political power for governing (Labbé 2009b).

For example, when the interest of the German state in recording nationality was related to the expansion of the German language in its territory, ethnicity was codified by questions related to mother tongue. Later on, relying on the ideology of race purity, the Nazi regime made the census and a multitude of administrative population records in Germany instrumental for measuring the population, all from a racial point of view.

The way in which personal identity is encoded in censuses creates collective identities that are foundational for nation-states. In this regard, the various census practices are encoding those identities that are appropriate modalities for supporting existing identity politics, rather than a true representation of the complex phenomenon of per-

sonal identity. In the US census, for example, from the beginning of the census practice, personal identity is racially defined by including race-related questions. Prior to the 1960 census that introduced self-identification, recording race was done by a simple visual inspection of the enumerator (Nobles 2002). In contrast to the US, where the census objectifies racial divisions as part of an antagonistic identity politics, in Brazil until 2000 the official ideology supported a discourse of “racial democracy” by using the category of *color* instead of sorting by *race* in their census: “Brazil’s intelligentsia, political elite, and census officials have emphasized racial mixture with the same vigilance that their American counterparts have emphasized racial purity” (Nobles 2002, 61).

What matters in France for official identity, for example, is the attribute of being a French citizen; consequently, the operation of identity codification in the census distinguishes between French citizens (those born in the territory of France) and foreigners. Within the category of French, the census does not have ethnic subdivisions because it is considered that the ethnicization of citizens would have the potential to create ethnic tensions and discrimination along ethnic lines. This approach to the census is based on the strong republican conception of the state (see Labbé 2009b). Any type of ethnic sorting is perceived in France as discriminatory: “... any official categorization is discriminatory and runs the risk of politicizing identities and weakening the cohesion of the French political nation” (Kertzer and Arel 2002, 24). The same tendency of not dividing by ethnicity is encountered in countries with high rates of immigration that found inspiration in the French model (Simon and Piche 2012). In this regard, the category of “New Zealander” in a 2006 census refers to the nation as a whole, rather than a particular group, and a similar move has been discernible in the census in Canada.

In another example, that of Israel, what matters for the official ideology of the state is the person’s religious affiliation, which is essential for realizing a binary classification: Jews are those of Judaic religion and non-Jews are all those who have a different religion (Goldscheider 2002). For the state of Israel, ethnicities are irrelevant and only religion is applicable for sorting the population; this fact is revealed by the disinterest to record the country of origin of those who are the third generation families born and established in Israel, for the purpose of

the census. In accordance with the dominant ideology of the state, the solidarity of the social corpus is created along religious lines and not ethnic or racial lines. Ethnic divisions are blurred over time within the Israeli Jewish group, since the country of origin of ancestors ceases to be recorded with the third generation that is born inside Israel's territory, and the social differentiation relevant for the state is codified based on religion, by grouping Jews and non-Jews (further recorded as Moslems, Christians, Druze, and others) (*ibid.*).

The census as a tool of governance

The census, primarily seen as a scientific tool, is at the same time a power technique (in Foucauldian terms), which delivers ethnic classification and produces consequences in real life. Administrative institutions responsible for evidencing and registering the population attach certifying documents, such as an identity card or a passport, to ethnicity, meaning citizenship or nationality, and these administrative inscriptions in turn produce consequences affecting the mobility and employment opportunities of people. All state institutions, such as political parties, governments, and parliaments, function by virtue of representing citizens who have been categorized by the procedures of classification and statistical counting: people are made subjects of government by multiple acts of classification. In this regard, the census plays not only the function of describing a socio-political image of reality, but also aims to intervene by sustaining and legitimating structures of representation in a political sense (political parties with an ethnic base, for example).

The census creates the grounds for the actions of ethno-political entrepreneurs, who by virtue of ethnic statistics can reclaim themselves as representatives of the ethnic groups due to the fact that these groups have been objectively measured and hence constituted through scientific methodologies. In Romania, for example, there are eighteen ethnic minorities that automatically access a seat in the parliament through affirmative action⁶ under the following two conditions: the

⁶ Other countries from Europe in which affirmative action is endorsed in regard to the political representation of ethnic minorities are Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Montenegro, and Slovenia.

presence of an ethnic minority is revealed, accounted, and validated by the census, and the existence of an organization (or several) that asserts the representation of that minority group. Insofar as ethnic minorities are automatically given seats in the parliament through affirmative action, even the persons who may choose not to cast a vote to support an ethnicity-based political party are, however, indirectly contributing to creating a parliamentary minority due to the ethnic census which made political representation possible for the given registered minority. Through the simple act of ethnic registration in the census, those who have opted to declare an ethnicity are giving access to the political podium for some ethnic entrepreneurs who are not necessarily voted in to represent individuals, but for whom the minority record in the census is sufficient to obtain a place in the parliament (affirmative action has derogations from the usual threshold). Ethnic counting in the census is the procedure which pretends to have the highest degree of legitimacy, at least when it is about the distribution of public resources; a quantum of resource allocation to minority organizations depends on the census results.

The census, as a modality of outlining ethnic divisions among people, is constitutive of ethnic-specific institutions, as well as institutions with a general scope of research that are not necessarily tied to representing a particular ethnicity (e.g., research institutes, think tanks, university departments, etc.). All these types of organizations which are producing ethnicity discourse are grounded in and have their object of activity only insofar as the ethnicity is objectified by quantifying it: the census is a practice of counting *par excellence*. Data gathering and censuses affect not only parliamentary arrangements and resource allocation, but also such bureaucratic devices of data gathering and statistics production shape our everyday thinking and perception and define what is possible: "The bureaucracy of statistics imposes not just by creating administrative rulings but by determining classifications within which people must think of themselves and of the actions that are open to them" (Hacking 1991,194). Therefore, a onetime conversation between two people (the enumerator and the respondent) in the framework of the census is transformed through scientific and administrative procedures into a social and scientific fact that has consequences not only for the social and political organization of a collectivity, but also for the life trajectory of individuals. The census is a scientific and

administrative practice with the greatest power to objectify ethnicity, and in the meantime, it is also a matrix of various types of discourse about ethnicity. In the absence of census records on ethnicity, any discourse about ethnicity would be superfluous. Inversely, any official act of ethnic assessment is a generator of ethnicity. I can but agree with Kertzer and Arel in concluding that: "... the census does much more than simply reflect social reality; rather it plays a key role in the construction of that reality" (2002, 2).

The census is a special type of classification, which makes all the subsequent sociological classifications that claim objectivity possible, such as opinion polls. Claims of sampling representativeness (including ethnic sampling) are based on the assumption that the census provides an accurate and complete listing of all units of analysis. In fact, due to high costs, censuses are done usually once every ten years and this sequencing makes them less reliable given the rapid social change, and more prone to represent a fixed social moment, or an instant picture taken under specific conditions (e.g., ethnic tension or tolerance, ethnic activism, etc.). Although the census is primarily an administrative counting procedure initiated and carried out by the state, census data acquired a *scientific status* over time, even in the case of highly controversial data constructed by political decisions. To give an example from the US, the concepts of race and ethnicity are considered analytical categories in scientific work, although the classification of races and ethnicities in the US census was not made by scientists, but made and advanced through administrative decisions and regulations. Evaluating the consequences of the Statistical Policy Directive 15, which institutionalized the categories of race and ethnicity in census data gathered in the US, Robbin notes:

The original standard stated and the Federal Register notices reiterated that the classification system was not presumed to have scientific status. Nevertheless, because the authority of the state had created the standard, the bureaucratic categorization of 'race' assumed an aura of scientific authority and objectivity. The population characteristics of "race" and "ethnicity" enumerated by the census and other administrative record-keeping systems became the benchmarks on which public and private sample surveys were based. (2000, 405–406)

Resistance to census categorization

At times, the challenging of census legitimacy occurred when people refused state intrusion into the private spheres of their lives. This was the case when a large number of citizens in the 1980s census in Germany boycotted the census for privacy reasons. However, the challengers of census categorization could also be academics who contest the validity of census data, or they could be ethno-political entrepreneurs who consider census counting inaccurate due to, *inter alia*, the exclusionary manner of constituting ethnic categories, the poor implementation of data gathering, or the small number (even the lack) of enumerators from among minorities.

An example of citizens defying the census is related to the “Jedi religion” phenomenon, which is a movement that started in 2001 and continued in subsequent censuses. As a result of an Internet campaign developed before the 2001 census, in nine countries⁷ worldwide there were people who choose the label *Other* under the category of religious affiliation, to which they also recorded their religion as *Jedi* or *Jedi Knight*—a title borrowed from the popular characters of the *Star Wars* movie series. The event was described in media, as well as in academic papers, and received strong reactions from national institutes of statistics which organize censuses, such as the Office for National Statistics (ONS) in the United Kingdom and the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Apparently, the UK census organizers saw the Jedi phenomenon eventually beneficial because, as one director of the ONS said, “Whatever its motive, the Jedi campaign may have worked in favour of the Census exercise. Census agencies worldwide report difficulties encouraging those in their late teens and twenties to complete their forms” (ONS 2003). On the contrary, the ABS viewed the fact of Jedi registration as a waste of public money and as impeding public planning. Moreover, ABS strongly reminded the public of the law punishing with a fine the reporting of “misleading” information in the census: “Most Australians value the census and ‘penalties’ are not an issue, even though the Census and Statistics Act does provide for

⁷ These countries were: Australia, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Ireland, Montenegro, New Zealand, Serbia, and the United Kingdom.

penalties of up to \$1000 for knowingly supplying false or misleading information” (ABS 2001). Although the two census agencies seem to take quite different positions, the way in which both statistical institutes chose to classify the Jedi religious affiliation denotes commonalities in interpreting data: ONS decided to include Jedi under the category of “no religion,” and ABS comprised it as “not defined.” This example shows that those who determine the results of the census are the census experts, as state agents who build and impose categories, and not the respondents, whose answers are considered as self-ascription. All these official responses make the census appear as a futile exercise insofar as people’s self-description cannot be accommodated by statistics-driven governmental thinking. Instead of being discarded as an option, if UK authorities classified Jedi as a religion, it would have become the fourth main religion, surpassing Sikhism, Judaism, and Buddhism. Analysts of the Jedi phenomenon explain that adherence to the Jedi religion was motivated by various reasons, ranging from a desire to have fun to a genuine religious belief originating in the *Star Wars* narrative, a narrative that is coextensive with a phenomenon of hyper-real religiosity (Possamai 2007). Nevertheless, the choice of a science-fiction movie character for one’s religious affiliation may be a symbolical impugnement of religious categories *per se*, by implying that already established religious denominations might be constructed around fictive characters as well. Mobilization for the *Jediism* grassroots movement may question the scientific value of the census practice itself.

Once inscribed in the census questionnaires, the categories are statistically processed, and the aggregated numbers are transformed from mutually exclusive to exclusivist categories. This way, census categories preserve in the long run a fixed social structure, which has little in common with the rapid changes that occur in real life. Exclusive ethnic categories in censuses do not allow and do not acknowledge social change, such as migration, educational and social mobility, acculturation, mixed marriages, bi- and multilingualism; these phenomena deem the fixed repertoire of census categories regarding race and ethnicity irrelevant. For census purposes, ethnic data are gathered and numbers are compiled, although there is not an agreed-upon definition of ethnicity, neither among scientists nor among political officials who organize censuses. Yet, ethnic groups are entities arguably based on numbers derived from the census; moreover, there are experts and

advocates who estimate the “true” number of ethnic group members that the census may fail to capture.

As I present below, another example of a controversy around the census as a descriptor of ethnicity is in relation to the Roma population, which is considered by both the academic community and by Roma rights activists to be underrepresented in census data of Central and Southeast Europe. In terms of political power (e.g., seats in parliament) and especially financial resources provided for Roma-targeted programs, it matters whether the number of Roma is, for example, half a million or more than two million people. What matters in policy-making and politics are the (high) numbers. Those who are involved in the production of numbers are social scientists (sociologists, demographers, statisticians) and political activists. Their methods and findings are usually invested with public trust. In some cases, academics themselves can act as ethno-political entrepreneurs and can enter the political arena.

3. FROM FISCAL TO ETHNIC CATEGORIES AND FURTHER ON TO ‘ETHNIC UNAVAILABLE’

Gypsies as a social and fiscal category

Beyond academics and ethno-political entrepreneurs who are interested in the categorization and counting of ethnic differences, there are also other expert branches of the state, which share a classificatory interest in regard to Gypsies/Roma. A historical overview of Gypsy categorization acknowledges two types of historical documents (including quantitative data) that provide official information about Gypsies during the Middle Ages. The first type of documents is the legal acts of donation or selling of slaves in the Romanian principalities. In feudalism, three categories of slave owners held legal powers over Gypsies: state, aristocracy, and church. Accordingly, the documents of selling or donating registered transfers of slaves among these three categories of owners. The second type of documents that gives statistical information about Gypsies is the so-called *catagrafii*, which was a type of data collected for administrative reasons. Historians consider these as forerunners of the modern census (Achim 2005). These two types

of historical documents and sources of information are examples of classifications that cross the initial boundaries of professional communities (legal and administrative), and transfer the constructed categories in the past into the sphere of current legal and fiscal domains of ethnic statistics (with policy and political applications). It is interesting to observe the transformation of the reference over time, from the administrative-fiscal domain to the fields of policy-making and academic scholarship: the categorization of Gypsies based on the specific interest of taxation corresponds to contemporary classificatory interests defining Roma as a policy target and epistemic object.

The legal acts of donation or selling slaves, where the Gypsy category appeared inscribed as a legal status, are the main official documents that recognize Gypsies as a fiscal population that had to be registered for the purposes of tax collection. For the Romanian principalities, tax records are among the few *official* sources of information about Gypsies during this period; other related administrative documents refer to different obligations of those classified as Gypsies and their owners, as well as to modalities of settling legal disputes where Gypsies are involved.

The inscription as “*țigani*” (Gypsies) in fiscal registries acknowledged their status as “*robi*” (slaves), which was one of the lowest strata of society. For the category of “*țigani*,” a different quantum of taxes to be paid was established, or even the exoneration of payment was regulated, which fell under the responsibility of the slave owner. Presumably, in those times there were strong incentives to be registered as a Gypsy in order to avoid taxation or pay a lower amount of money. Sometimes private landowners or church representatives profited from the incentives resulting from the registration of Gypsies as a fiscal category in order to reduce their fiscal burden. Achim described this fact as

The system of tax exemptions that existed in the Romanian principalities, according to which even private slaves were exempt from public duties, and the boyars' and especially the monasteries' pursuit of a labor force that was exempt from such public duties led to situations in which some feudal masters would declare certain of the peasants tied to their estates to be “Gypsies” in censuses organised periodically by the State to determine the number of taxpayers present on its territory. In

this way, serfs were included among the ranks of those exempt from obligations to the State. The Austrian authorities noted at the beginning of their rule in Bukovina that on the estates of the monasteries lived a category of “Gypsies” who kept clean houses and who were well dressed etc., who were in fact peasants recorded in the monasteries records as slaves in order not to pay tax on them. (2004, 57)

The tax evasion through the “false” registration of peasants under the category of Gypsies on the part of their masters certainly occurred, but quantifiably assessing the extent of this phenomenon is difficult. Moreover, the categorization as “Gypsy” was at times acquired through marriage and not only by “false” registration in tax records:

There is no doubt that in the eighteenth century there were individuals and families of Romanians who entered the ranks of slaves. We can speculate as to how many of the slaves lacking Gypsy characteristics referred to by Kogălniceanu were in fact Romanian peasants who through marriage or tax evasion had been added to the ranks of boyar or monastery slaves. (Achim 2004, 57)

The fact that laws prohibiting marriage between “*țigani*” slaves and Romanian serfs were enacted both in Valahia and Moldova indicates that marriages between the two groups should have been rather significant in number since they attracted the attention of legislators leading to the interdiction of such marriages codified by law. Probably there were many cases when Gypsies became “Romanians” and Romanians became “Gypsies” for fiscal purposes, although admittedly the extent of overlap in categorizations is hardly, if at all, quantifiable. A quite limited number of Gypsies entered the category of Romanians by being freed from slavery by their owners or by buying their status of free men from their owners. Inversely, Romanian serfs acquired the Gypsy label in the official classifications of the time either by marrying people registered as Gypsies, or by selling themselves to slave owners due to the deterioration of their economic situation that made paying their taxes impossible.

The interests in the classification of Gypsies were highly divergent: on the one hand, the state was logically interested to re-classify those

labeled as Gypsies into Romanians to collect higher taxes, and on the other hand, the slave owners (private landowners or churches) were interested in keeping their Gypsies' assets as such because of the benefits of lower taxation. This phenomenon of overlapping official classifications due to fiscal reasons or to mixed marriages is downplayed by both Romanian and emerging Roma historiography.

Moreover, in the Middle Ages, Gypsies in the territory of the Romanian principalities were not the only slaves and were not slaves for the longest time, but there were also Tatars who were enslaved as war prisoners during the battles between Tatar invaders and local settlers. While both Gypsies and Tatars were fiscally and socially "robi," or slaves, nevertheless, the tax records as well as sale or donation documents have maintained a distinction between the two categories: Gypsy slaves and Tatar slaves. In the works of historians interested in the Romanian principalities during the Middle Ages, there are missing descriptions of the relationships that may have been established between the two categories of slaves (Gypsies and Tatars), and it is not clear whether the two populations might have been mixed by their masters in joint communities for practical reasons, or if they lived separately. Were they prohibited from intermarrying, as it happened at times between different categories of Gypsy slaves or between Gypsies and free people? Have there been mixed settlements in which Gypsies and Tatars worked together for the same owner (private, state, or church)? Unfortunately, existing historiographies do not provide answers to these questions.

What the above discussion implies is the transformation of a social status codified as a fiscal category into an ethnic category, which is the result of a tedious and long process of interaction between official-administrative classifications and scholarly works (mainly of historians). Perhaps it is easier to approach this process from the other end of the continuum, that of the Romanian ethnicity. The metamorphosis of the category "rumâni" in Valahia from a social status to an ethnicity (and later to a nationality) points out the similarities with the transformation of the category "țigani." During the period from 1600 to 1750, the word "rumâni" has designated the lowest social strata of unfree peasants, and the word's mention in official documents of the time was only in relation to the fiscal obligations of those so categorized, and in relation to the land and/or their owners (Giurescu

1943). It is only after 1750, with the rapid emancipation from serfdom, when “rumâni” (at that time already an obsolete term for serfdom) was elevated by intellectuals and historians to an ethnic and later on to a national (Romanian) status, by stressing the affinities based on a common shared language. In regard to the ambiguous status of the word “rumâni,” Giurescu notes:

The names that unfree peasants have, both in Slavonic and Romanian documents, raise some very important problems. Why have they been named *vlahi* and *rumâni*, and what would be the relationship between the ethnic and social meaning of these words? Has the social meaning been formed through a degradation of the ethnic meaning, as has been believed until recently, or the name of the lowest social class has imposed itself as a national name? (1943, 140; author’s translation, emphasis in the original)

In official classifications, the words “rumân” and “țigan” were merely fiscal categories for a social status of unfree people who were not in possession of land. Although the status of “țigan,” equivalent to that of “rob,” or slave, was socially and economically lower than that of “rumân” (Giurescu 1943) or serf (Achim 2004), in the official documents of that time there is no indication about the usage of both words (“țigan” and “rumân”) in relation to an ethnic category in its current acceptance. The sociologist Gheorghe (1997, 2013) acknowledges that the label of “țigan” initially designated a social status rather than an ethnicity. In this regard Gheorghe explains: “Tsigane in the Romanian language was equivalent with *rob* which might be translated as ‘slave.’ So it was a social identity, much more than an ethnic cultural identity, marking, I repeat, an inferior social position, a legal segregation between Gypsies and non-Gypsies and between Gypsies belonging to different owners” (1997, 158). It is worth noting that in a comprehensive collection of 235 historical documents (Achim and Tomi 2010) from 1830 to 1860 referring to slavery in Romanian principalities, all the references to “țigan”/“țigani” (Gypsy/Gypsies) are made to those registered for fiscal purposes or selling transactions, and not a single reference is made to them as an ethnic group.

Even more important for apprehending the transformation of a social status into an ethnic category are the statistical documents that

resulted from the “catagrafii,” the administrative data gathering, which preceded the modern censuses. The category of Gypsy was recorded in these administrative documents during the period of 1830–1860 in the Romanian principalities of Valahia (Țara Românească) and Moldova (Achim 2005). The beginning of statistical compilations in the Romanian principalities coincided with the gathering of statistical data about Gypsies. The first such collection of aggregate data that referred to Gypsies was made in Valahia in 1838. This comprehensive data collection was the first one that recorded nationality. There are no indications on how and according to which criteria this first record of nationality was done. However, it appears that, for example, under the label of Serbians, many people with a Bulgarian identity and coming from Bulgaria were recorded (*ibid.*), hence presumably it was also the perception and judgment of enumerators that contributed to the making of nationality.

This collection of data, among other objectives, is concerned with mapping the population for the purposes of taxation and constituting evidence of different categories of taxpayers’ shares. Gypsies were recorded during these data collection practices with their occupational denominations, such as *aurari* (goldsmiths), *argintari* (silversmiths), *rudari* (wood workers), *zidari* (bricklayers), *plugari* (ploughmen), etc. Data collection for the purposes of taxation registered only those Gypsies who were state slaves, and not those owned by boyars or by churches. However, as the slaves were freed by the state or released by boyars, they were registered in “catagrafii” as emancipated slaves (*dezrobiți* or emancipated), hence maintaining the reference to their former subordinate status. The imprecision of the initial statistical data collection is due, *inter alia*, to a variety of reasons related to the reluctance of slave owners to declare their slaves, the refusal of those surveyed to participate, the existing social tensions and fears of new taxes, and the enumerators’ and census commissions’ lack of professionalism. More importantly, during the centralization of statistical data from 1832, there could have been a significant number of cases in which “Gypsies” were likely recorded under other labels, such as “free of paying taxes” (“slobozi de plata birului”), “without wealth” (“fără stare”), “poor,” or even “craftsman” (Achim 2005, 111). It is important to note that beyond these ambiguities in categorization, the label of Gypsies in official statistics until the first modern census (1930) followed a social classification and not an ethnic one:

Statistical data and population censuses during the modern period in Romania have operated with ethnic parameters only in a few cases, and eventually only in the case of Jews and foreigners residing in Romania without Romanian citizenship. This was the case with the general population censuses in 1899 and 1912. A record of ethnic origin and mother tongue of the inhabitants in the country was done only starting with the general population census in 1930. From that time, the notion of “Gypsy” was used in the Romanian [official] statistics in an ethnic sense. (In the period of emancipation “Gypsy” meant a socio-fiscal category, not having a one hundred percent ethnic coverage.) The census in 1930 was the first to register the population by their declared ethnic origin (“neam”) and “mother tongue”. (Achim 2005, 119; author’s translation)

Therefore, both terms (“țigani” and “rumâni”) have traversed a long way from a social and fiscal category to an ethnic (and national) category, that of Gypsies/Roma and Romanians. The legally enforced division between “țigani” and “rumâni” based on their relatively dissimilar social statuses prevented a mobilization of the two populations for overcoming the common oppression exerted by the ruling elite. By creating well-defined ethnic boundaries between “țigani” and “rumâni,” the ruling class averted social mobilization of the oppressed to challenge the status quo.

Gypsies as an undercounted census category

As mentioned before, the first census that introduced ethnic categories in counting the population in Romania was conducted in 1930. This census was the first comprehensive data collection without a fiscal scope: the census justification resided in the compliance with international regulations under the League of Nations and also in taking stock of the entire “Romanian people” (*neamul românesc*) within the new borders after the First World War (Manuilă 1931). This census was made possible due to substantial financial and technical support provided by the Rockefeller American Foundation; for this occasion the Foundation provided automatic and manual tabulation machines for

sorting and counting (ibid.). This census was the first one conducted by the Romanian state, when after 1918 Transylvania, Bessarabia, and Bucovina became part of the territory of Romania following the dismembering of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires at the end of the First World War. The introduction of ethnicity in the 1930 census, and also in the subsequent one from 1941, was politically motivated in order to demonstrate that the Romanian provinces are inhabited mainly by ethnic Romanians (Achim 2001, 2005).

It was not only a political decision to introduce ethnic categories in the census for making political claims, but the 1930 and 1941 censuses also involved work carried out by scholars led by Sabin Manuilă, the director of the Central Institute of Statistics. Manuilă was a scholar, but also adviser on the ethnic and population issues of Ion Antonescu, the military leader (*Conducător*) of the Romanian state for most of the Second World War. Manuilă introduced ethnic categories in the Romanian census of 1930 and maintained them in the census of 1941; his beliefs were supported by the political class of that time, according to which Romania should become an ethnically homogenous state, comprised of ethnic Romanians. Manuilă was involved in planning population exchanges with Hungary and the USSR (but also with Greece, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia) in seeking to achieve this vision of an ethnically homogenous state. Such population exchanges aimed at “the elimination of all minority populations and the repatriation of all Romanian populations in the neighboring countries” (Idem 2001, 594). In order to demonstrate to powerful Germany that Romania should regain its previous territorial possessions, Manuilă and his scientific collaborators chose to provide proof and evidence based on census results and scholarly research, such as ethnic maps. Manuilă was not only a reputed demographer and an expert in ethnic issues of that time, but he was also a fervent eugenicist⁸ whose concept of the nation had a biological and racial connotation. This concept of the biological nation inspired his vision of racist politics that he predi-

⁸ Manuilă was the founder and president (chosen with unanimity) of the Demography, Anthropology, and Eugenic Section of the Romanian Social Institute since 1935 (see Georgescu 1936). He was also Vice President of the Royal Society of Heredity and Anthropology.

cated in scientific papers⁹ and advocated in his role as political counselor. His allegiance to racial science coupled with his political actions raises the question of whether the category of “Other” inscribed in censuses reflected his eugenic vision and plans to achieve an ethnically homogenous Romania. The otherness of Gypsies in terms of ethnicity was largely influenced by the eugenicist visions of some renowned Romanian scholars of the time who regarded Gypsies as a dysgenic population.¹⁰ The “unilateral transfer” of Gypsies and Jews, as part of the population policies based on census data, was put in practice through the partial deportation of the Jews and Gypsies in Transnistria where many of them died. The deportation of Jews and Gypsies in Transnistria is acknowledged as “the Romanian segment of the Holocaust” (Achim 2005, 142).

And yet the 1930 census was challenged by scholars claiming that Gypsies were undercounted, and only carefully designed research would be able to give their real number. For example, commenting on the registration of Gypsies in the 1930 census that recorded ethnicity for the first time in Romania, a sociologist and ethnographer who specialized in Gypsy studies advanced the idea of “camouflaging.” Thus, Chelcea (1944) notes that the phenomenon of “camouflage”—meaning in this case the Gypsies’ attempt to pass as Romanians—is widespread among Gypsies, and their “correct” number should be much higher than the one resulting from the census. He saw that for bio-political reasons this phenomenon of camouflage should be accounted for, and those Gypsies who adopted the identity of Romanian nationals should be precisely identified for who they really are (in

⁹ For example, Manuilă wrote the “Hindering of dysgenics, of undesirables must go until their complete sterilization” (1941, 2; author’s translation). Manuilă also explicitly linked population politics with eugenics in racist statements: “Racist politics is not a secret politics that must be put in practice in the chancelleries of governments. Racist politics is the politics of the masses, which should be convinced by racial commandments of the people (*ale neamului*) and which should have the holy ideal of the future biological betterment of the population” (1941, 3–4; author’s translation).

¹⁰ See, for example, Bucur (2002) and Turda (2009) for a comprehensive analysis of the development of the eugenics movement in Romania in the interwar period, with references to scholars addressing Gypsies/Roma as a dysgenic population targeted for sterilization and deportation.

the opinion of the author, identified as Gypsies), and not for who they want to pass for (respectively, Romanians). Accordingly, the role of scholarship on Gypsies would be a work of disclosing Gypsies who are not registered “correctly” and enhancing the tools for correctly registering them by ethnographic methods, including a simple visual inspection. Chelcea writes:

We consider for an easier presentation of the problem that Gypsies should not be regarded based on the categories as we studied them: “*the camouflage*” of Gypsies in the census is more or less general. If some of them feel more integrated into our society, some others in exchange realize that they will be “colonized.” Therefore, they will eschew declaring sincerely—all of them—and only scientific research would entirely prove the processes of camouflage among Gypsies. (1944, 75; author’s translation, emphasis in the original)

Chelcea conducted his own research in Olt Country (*Țara Oltului*), a region in Romania, to prove the theory of Gypsies’ camouflage, and based on his ethnographic research in this area he reached the conclusion that villages could be seen on a continuum of categories depending on the extent of Gypsy camouflage: from villages where Gypsies recorded “honestly” their ethnicity, to those villages where they completely “camouflaged.” Beyond this continuum Chelcea (1944) found that there are also villages where there are no Gypsies. His classification of villages was then put at work in order to highlight what the “reality” is and how this departs from the official census results:

Let’s look at the reality: from 53 villages with Gypsies, Gypsies declared themselves sincerely only in 9 (17%). From 53 villages with Gypsies in Olt Country, in 18 villages they have been partially declared as Gypsies (34%); next is the category of villages where Gypsies camouflage was complete. From 53 villages, there are 20 villages in which Gypsies have disappeared from a statistical point of view (37.7%). (Chelcea 1944, 76; author’s translation)

The author mentioned in a footnote that seven villages are without Gypsies. By considering the data revealed by surveys (including his

own) as objective, as opposed to census data that fail to properly account for ethnicity, Gypsies appear as a racialized population whose true characteristics should be better obtained through external observation and scientific estimates than by self-ascription. After careful calculations based on survey data and demographic projections, the author reached the conclusion that the 1930 Romanian census grossly undercounted the number of Gypsies by at least two times: the real number would be 525,000 in comparison with 262,501 as noted by the census.

However, according to Chelcea (1944), by anthropological standards, beyond the camouflage, what impedes more precision and complicates the “correct” enumeration of Gypsies by the census even further is related to the number of what he terms as “corci” (and what the Nazi ideology of the time termed as “bastards” or as “half-breed Gypsies”). These “corci” in Chelcea’s (1944) monograph are those with mixed ancestry coming from marriages between Gypsies and Romanians. As I will present further in this chapter, the intricacies between the number of Gypsies/Roma presented by censuses and the estimations circulated in academic research continue to rest on the premise of a Gypsies/Roma undercount.

To sum up, reconstructing the history of making ethnic categories in the interwar census, as the example of Romania illustrates, shows that ethnicity was regarded as an object of political definition with the specific aim of ethnic politics, and not merely a scholarly statistical-demographic enterprise of measuring ethnicity as an “objective reality.” Moreover, it is a question of inquiry whether the supposed anonymity and individual protection of data collected in 1930 and 1941 censuses was respected. At least in fixing the contingents of people to be deported it seems that political authorities used census findings as a reference point for their decisions.

Roma as an unavailable ethnic category

The resistance of people to census classifications and categorizations is a fact registered by the census itself. The case of the 2011 Romanian census is illustrative of contesting the ethnic categories *per se*. In the example below, individuals who opposed ethnic classification in the census are not allowed by experts to stand outside of the official ethnic

categorization system. Moreover, the category of “Roma/Gypsies” in the 2011 Romanian census appears to be a highly inconsistent amalgamation of different labels resulting from the process of post-coding of census data.

In the 2011 Romanian census an open, ethnicity-related question was introduced as an optional item in order to give subjects the possibility to self-assign an ethnicity (as well as a religion and a mother tongue), but they also had the option to select the answer “undeclared” (numerically coded as 99). The simple introduction of an optional ethnicity question led to a high number of individuals who chose not to declare an ethnicity. A press release¹¹ of the National Institute of Statistics (NIS), presenting the final results of the census, states that “for the persons who *didn’t want* to declare” (emphasis added) their ethnicity, this characteristic could not be recorded. The way NIS framed ethnicity suggests that ethnicity exists objectively, but it might not be disclosed; moreover, ethnicity is unique, so a person cannot have multiple ethnicities. This viewpoint, also expressed by sociologists and sustained by mass media, highlights that ethnicity is a well-defined attribute that certainly must exist as an objective reality; accordingly, not having an ethnicity (and, moreover, not having a single ethnicity) is abnormal. Despite these expert views, a large segment of the population registered themselves as “undeclared” in the 2011 census: they either considered the ethnic category as irrelevant for them, or they could not associate with any precise ethnicity (which also indicates its irrelevancy). More precisely, the number of 1,236,810 (or 6.14% of the total population)¹² of “undeclared” or, in other words, un-ethnic citizens surpasses the number of the biggest ethnic minority in Romania, the Hungarians (1,227,623 people) and of the second largest ethnic minority, the Roma (621,573 people). This fact makes the *ethnicity not available* category the largest (ethnic) minority group in Romania; ironically, if they had seats in the Parliament like

¹¹ NIS press release no. 159 from July 4, 2013 (in Romanian only): http://www.insse.ro/cms/files/statistici/comunicate/RPL/RPL%20_rezultate%20definitive_r.pdf.

¹² Data collected from the NIS website (in Romanian only): <http://www.recensamantromania.ro/rezultate-2/>.

other minority groups, they would have the largest number of (non-) ethnic parliamentarians.

This fact of refusing to be classified by the census on ethnic criteria was treated by experts in mass media as “a great anomaly” of the 2011 census: the almost unanimous expectations of journalists and experts were that people would easily and eagerly order themselves into an ethnic classification scheme with mutually exclusive categories (as in the case of Romanian census). For instance, one article alarmed that “the number of persons who didn’t declare their ethnicity at 2011 census (over 1.23 millions) is overwhelmingly high in comparison with previous censuses: about 2000 people in 2002, 800 in 1992 or the maximum registered in 1930—5052.”¹³ The interpretation of the census results given by sociologists was that the high number of non-ethnics is attributable to Roma who conceal their identity, and whose number should be in reality some three times bigger than that recorded in the census.

Beyond the experts’ certainty of a Roma hidden identity, the Roma ethnicity in the 2011 Romanian census seems to be a highly elaborated construction of statisticians, and less the result of people’s self-ascription. Although the census instructions for the enumerators make it clear that in the census sheet the exact ethnic name/label, whom a person freely and openly declares him/herself, should be registered, this principle of self-asserting an ethnicity was in fact nullified in the stage of data processing. More precisely, the ethnicity question in the census template was the following: “What ethnic group does the person consider he/she belongs to?” This question was placed as an optional item under the rubric “Ethnic and Cultural Characteristics,” together with two other questions referring to religion and mother tongue. It is important to note that for this rubric the instruction given to the enumerators

¹³ The article (in Romanian) I refer to is entitled “The Great Anomaly of the 2011 Census: The ‘Unavailable’ Surpass in Numbers of Hungarians and Roma” (author’s translation) and appeared on one of the main online news websites, called *HotNews*. The article could be accessed at <http://www.hotnews.ro/stiri-esential-15161665-tablou-interactiv-marea-anomalie-recensamantului-indisponibilitii-batut-numar-etniciei-maghiari-romi-peste-1-2-milioane-persoane-nu-declarat-etnia-2011-iar-numarul-oficial-romilor-este-doar-621-000.htm>.

was the following: "Each person is free to express his or her opinion, without any constraints." Despite the huge variety of self-ascribed labels *freely* chosen by people, in the centralization of data and in the release of data for public use, under the umbrella label of "rom"¹⁴ (code 1200) no less than nineteen different names elicited from the subjects' answers were brought together: "1201—rom, 1202—băieș, 1203—boldean, 1204—caștal, 1205—căldărar, 1206—cărămidar, 1207—cocalar, 1208—gabor, 1209—geambaș, 1210—lăieș, 1211—lăutar, 1212—pletos, 1213—rudar, 1214—spoitor, 1215—țigan, 1216—țigan de mătase, 1217—ursar, 1218—vătraș, 1219—zavragiu." All these nineteen labels were amalgamated under a single one, that of "rom," which represents only an option from all the nineteen labels (disaggregated data were not provided by NIS, thus it is unknown how many people chose, in fact, the label "rom"). The labels from the enumeration above are mostly occupational categories used in the external classification or self-classification of people according to specific branches of crafts, which were often associated with "Gypsy types of work" (similar to categorization practices in the Middle Ages) as, for example, "cărămidar" or bricks maker, "lăutar" or musician, "ursar" or bear trainer, "boldean" or flower seller, "geambaș" or horse dealer, and so on. In the construction of Roma ethnicity by the census, ethnic denominations such as "rom" and "țigan" are brought together for statistical purposes, even if many of those who consider themselves "rom" would not want to be considered "țigan," and vice versa. In the 2011 census, the ethnic label "rom" was the most heterogeneous category for an ethnicity: by comparison, the Romanian ethnic category had 7 different labels, Hungarian had 3, and German had 6 (NIS 2011a).

Another point in asserting the power of the census to construct ethnic identities is observable in how children are classified along ethnic lines. While for adults the principle is that of free self-declaration of ethnic affiliation, for children ethnicity is assigned by adults. The census manual¹⁵ requires that the enumerators record the ethnicity, mother tongue, and religion of children under the age of 14, declared on their behalf by their parents. Enumerators are requested to do the

¹⁴ According to the document NIS (2011a) from the NIS website.

¹⁵ Based on the NIS (2011b) document, "Manualul personalului de recensământ" (The manual of the census personnel) from the NIS website.

same in regard to children from orphanages (no age is noted), but in this case all three characteristics (optional for adults) are to be recorded in accordance with the declaration by the Administration Council of the Orphanage (NIS 2011b). If the record of mother tongue is arguably a declaration that can be obtained from parents or representatives of the Administration Council, in the case of orphans the registration of children's ethnicity and religion by a third party declaration is problematic for several reasons. In the case of ethnicity, and especially for children coming from diverse ethno-cultural backgrounds (parental or intergenerational), the declaration of the parents might not coincide with the children's choice. First, assigning children's ethnicity in a distinctive box may not recognize the diversity of the ethno-cultural heritage of families with mixed backgrounds, and may even stir disputes among family members. Second, recording children's ethnicity may influence their self-perception, inscribing their future identity, and constraining options that may otherwise influence their life chances (such as choosing a circle of friends, educational options, affiliation with ethnic-related activities). Third, in the medium and long run, the ethnic affiliation of children can change in adulthood, therefore potentially making the exercise of recording ethnicity (and religion as well) for minors a highly inaccurate and futile endeavor. Importantly, statistical post-coding of ethnic categories adds to the social construction of children's ethnicity, and this procedure further increases the number of those subjected to an ethnicity by census mechanisms.

Another category of people whose ethno-cultural characteristics are obtained by declarations of a third party are persons with special needs, such as the deaf and people with mental health problems. In this last case, the constructed character of ethnic identity is even more obvious: concepts used for carrying out the census suppose that the person with special needs would like to assume an ethnic identity without having any evidence in this regard. Data collection for census purposes contradicts the census principle of self-assumed identity, and in fact treats ethnicity as a visible characteristic that could be observed and noted by others rather than by oneself.

The above arguments, related to the artificiality of recording ethnicity, appear also in the case of persons who are temporarily absent (during the time of the census); in these instances, the declaration of ethnicity is made by other persons living in the household. Although

there are no data reflecting the share of ethnicity declared by third parties in overall ethnic statistics, it is probable that the methods of recording ethnicity in the census, as in the above described examples, play an important role in defining official numbers along the ethnic (and also religious) lines.

Compared with the communist regime in Romania, when the pressures from authorities was for Gypsies to declare themselves Romanians, leading to many people conforming to this request, after 1990 the official pressures was the opposite. Significantly, the pressure comes not only from Roma NGOs that have an organizational interest in increasing self-awareness and the number of Roma, but also from statistical authorities, albeit they are expected to have a neutral stance on the ethnic self-affiliation of all citizens. It is revealing that the chief of the National Institute of Statistics (NIS) asked for an increase in Roma self-declarations for the sake of attracting financial resources from the European Union. In 2011, Agerpres, the Romanian national news agency, released the following declaration¹⁶ of the chief of the NIS, the one who administered the census: “For the population and household census from 20–31 October [2011] Roma should assume their ethnic affiliation; the amount of European funds that can be allocated for their social integration depends directly on, as much as possible, a *correct* estimate” (author’s translation, emphasis added). This plea for “correct” self-declaration was widely disseminated by all media channels, insisting on the idea that Roma should not hide their true identity and register in the census accordingly. In some cases in the media this inducement was accompanied by reminding people that the false declaration of personal data could lead to fines.

Curiously, for an alleged neutral institution such as the NIS, there is no similar pressure toward other ethnicities to declare their “true” identities, implicitly assuming that other ethnicities are registering themselves correctly by default, or implying that other ethnicities do not need European funds for social development and integration. Mass media outlets constantly issued campaigns on the topic of Roma refusing to admit their “true” identity, especially at the time of the national census.

¹⁶ Declaration retrieved from <http://www.agerpres.ro/social/2011/07/11/ins-la-recensamantul-din-octombrie-populatia-roma-ar-trebuie-sa-si-asume-apartenenta-etnica-18-55-16>.

For example, an article from one of the leading Romanian newspapers had a revealing title: “How the ‘Silk Gypsies’ lost money for integration” (Lăcătuș 2010).¹⁷ The article asserts that European funds for Roma integration cannot be obtained because of the reluctance of some Roma to admit their ethnic identity in the census. The interviews with a few “Silk Gypsies” who have, in the opinion of the journalist, concealed their true allegiance are illustrative for the reasons why some “Roma” contradict the expectations to assume a Roma label. The following were the reasons given by a leader of one village for declaring himself Romanian and not Roma: “We are not Roma because we don’t speak the Romani language. We are ‘Silk Gypsies’ because we speak only the Romanian language. We don’t know another language. So, why should they call us Roma? We have declared ourselves Romanians.” Another interviewed person also stated his justification for registering as Romanian in census: “In my identity paper it is written that I’m Romanian so Romanian I am. Roma people know the Romani language, whereas I know only the Romanian language” (ibid.).

Also interesting is the declaration, in the same article, of a county adviser on Roma issues: “Officially, Sibiu county has only 17,125 Roma people out of a total population of more than 421,000 inhabitants. The number is inaccurate, the real number [of Roma] being at least four times bigger. In the Roșia village, for example, only two persons have declared themselves as Roma, these two being the mayor’s advisers on Roma issues. All the others have declared themselves Romanians.” In journalistic parlance, an alternative title for the article would be “Roma leave their local ethno-political entrepreneurs offside.” The fact that in a locality only the quasi-political representatives declared themselves Roma is telling for two reasons. First, the declaration of Roma identity in the case of political leaders comes with benefits of occupying a political function, while for simple citizens, Roma or not, the benefits of ethnic membership are hard to grasp. Second, the absence of followers of the Roma political leaders in declaring Roma ethnicity in that village shows the huge gap between those appointed as Roma representatives and those whom they supposedly represent.

¹⁷ The title of the article and the quotes from it in the text are the author’s translation.

A first conclusion drawn from the analyses of the 2011 census is that ethnicity recording, although considered as an optional item and freely expressed by the persons interviewed, fails to match these two premises. More precisely, ethnicity recording is not an optional and a self-assigned matter as far as it requires third party declaration (parents, orphanage representatives, persons from the same household) in regard to ethnicity and religion. Then, as presented above, in the case of constructing Roma as a category in this census, data revealing any detail (local characteristics, occupations, dialects, sub-group affiliations, etc.) did not count as official statistics. Particular identities that people consider their own are discounted in the processing of census data and the presentation of it to the public. The concepts on which the census is carried out disregard that some people did not associate with a (single) ethnicity. In addition, the interpretation of census data by media and experts in regard to persons who have not declared affiliation to an ethnic group and their relegation to the Roma category demonstrate that some journalists and experts still see ethnicity as an essential and objectively measurable characteristic.

4. PROBLEMATIC CONSENSUS ON THE ROMA UNDERCOUNT IN CENSUSES

Estimates of the Roma population's size were continuously produced and disseminated throughout history in Eastern and Western Europe. From the early efforts to count Gypsies, all the official attempts to statistically aggregate data about Gypsies (and later on Roma) were encountered with reluctance by intellectual elites and scholars who did not trust these numbers. A common explanation advanced by scholars for the undercount of Gypsies/Roma was the supposed unwillingness of Gypsies/Roma to admit their "true" identity and their desire to pass as having another ethnicity that brings more prestige. Yet, in the eyes of experts, it is only Gypsies/Roma who wanted to pass as having another ethnicity: for members of other ethnic groups no similar concerns were raised. Under various historical circumstances, members of different ethnic groups adopted the nationality of their countries of residence through acculturation. Nowadays, for example, people from Central and Eastern Europe moving to Western countries adopt

more prestigious nationalities (citizenships) of their new countries without being conceived as fraudulently passing for another identity: they do not have to remain tied to their origin, unlike Roma. The term “passing” applies only in regard to Gypsies/Roma as a reference to their alleged attempts to obfuscate and cheat the enumerators by misreporting their “true” identity (see the examples of the interwar period census and of the 2011 census from Romania in previous sections).

In the academic community and policy circles, the size and profile of the Roma population are considered as facts, even as scientific. The line of argument proposed by Latour (2005) is that of exploring academic controversies related to scientific facts rather than try to consider them settled as final products of mature science. But there is no controversy to explore in regard to the number of Roma in the census due to the fact that everyone, including scientists, agrees that Roma are undercounted. On the contrary, there is a curious consensus among the stakeholders that Roma are undercounted by censuses, and this general agreement surpasses the academic community and the statistical offices. Instead, the controversy is between the census counts of the Roma population and estimates produced as a result of quantitative research. The parties that agree on the undercount allegations about Roma are as diverse as the consensus is strong: the academic community, Roma and non-Roma NGOs, policymakers, international organizations, and representatives from across the political spectrum. It is the nature of this consensus on the undercounted number of Roma, as well as the circumstantial disagreements that further on I will explore.

Even though the census is regarded almost unanimously as a practice that undercounts Roma, nevertheless for quantitative researchers the census is considered a good enough tool of enumeration for the purpose of averaging the profile of the Roma population. Yet, I do not wish to engage myself in finding the “correct” number of Roma, the path taken by stakeholders, nor do I wish to suggest the feasibility of such a path or indicate that a correct number could be found independent of measurement schemes. I believe that the size of the Roma population reflected in a number is highly circumstantial and dependent on the political interests of those who count. The circumstantial factors are to be observed in the conjectural disagreements between experts, for example, and representatives of Roma NGOs concerning the degree of Roma underrepresentation in the census. Usually, while

researchers assert that the census is undercounting Roma, they nevertheless also believe that NGO representatives tend to overcount Roma and to inflate their number. However, the disagreement is secondary and it is a matter of degree, while the agreement about undercounting the Roma in the census prevails. Extensive disagreement about the “real” or “correct” number of Roma between researchers in different disciplines, or between researchers and NGO representatives, was not a sufficient reason to conceive that an exact number to reflect the size of a Roma population could not objectively exist. Instead of questioning rough numbers as simple statistical artifacts (as Roma population estimates are), the tendency was quite the opposite: to elaborate better methodologies for measurement to account for the size of the Roma population.

It was the decade following 1990, when better methodologies emerged in countries of Central and Eastern Europe as a collective work of academics in disciplines such as demography, sociology, ethnography, and anthropology. In search of objectivity and the ability to produce reliable numbers, for many research projects the external assignment of ethnic categories (hetero-identification) was an alternative to census enumeration, although only in the case of Roma and not other ethnicities. In order to produce estimates about the number of Roma in the period after the 1990s, many sociologists turned to other informants, such as neighbors, administrators, and local authority officials, for an evaluation of Roma ethnicity. Even today in various types of research targeting Roma, sociologists rely to some extent on external ethnicity assessments done by others, especially by Roma NGO representatives.

Not only the present is described by estimates, but even the future: demographers project Roma population size and profiles for the next ten, twenty, or fifty years. Mass media was quite eager to regularly circulate these numbers in articles that succeeded in pointing out the demographic “danger” and “concern” of the Roma population increase. On the one hand, various research institutes or NGOs, by providing the “correct” account of Roma, are claiming expertise and legitimacy in the field of “Roma issues.” On the other hand, “Roma issues,” as a stand-alone field of knowledge and intervention, as it became, vigorously (re)emerged as a result of Roma ethnic statistical compilations (similar to the interwar period). Despite “Roma issues” being based on

agreed-upon higher estimates of Roma than the census numbers, there are some instances of divergence in regard to the number of Roma in CEE countries. As it appears in a UNDP (2002) report, the agreement on the census undercount of the Roma, as well as the differences on population estimates, could be noticed in the following:

Romania: Official data (1992 census) count 409,723 Roma, or 1.8 percent of the population. Different expert estimates (Institute for Research of the Quality of Life, 1998) place this figure at around 1.5 million, or 6.5 percent of the population. Other estimates report between 1.4 million and 2.5 million Roma, making this group the largest Roma population in Europe and possibly the world.

Bulgaria: Official data (2001 census) report 365,797 people of Roma identity or 4.7 percent of the population. Different experts' estimates (data from sociological polls, labor offices, social assistance services Ministry of Interior) vary between 600,000 and 750,000, without showing essential changes over the last years.

Hungary: The 1990 Hungarian census reported that 142,683 Hungarians were Roma, the 2001 census registered 190,046 Roma in the country. Roma groups and NGOs put this number between 400,000 and 500,000, and sometimes go as high as 800,000. The sample survey generally recognized as the most systematic attempt to calculate *inter alia* the size of the Roma population was undertaken in 1993/94, and estimated that on 1 January 1994, there were 456,646 Roma living in Hungary (a little under 5 percent of the population).

Slovakia: Official data (2001 census) report 89,920 people of Roma identity, or 1.7 percent of the population. However, the London-based Minority Rights Group NGO estimates the number to be 480,000 to 520,000, or 9 percent to 10 percent of the total population. This would make the Roma the second largest minority in Slovakia, after the Hungarians.

Czech Republic: According to official data (2001 census), the number of Roma is 11,718, sharply below the 1991 census figure of 32,903.39. Different experts' estimates vary between 160,000 and 300,000 (Liégeois 1994). The Minority Rights Group estimates the number to be 275,000 (2.5 percent to 2.9 percent of the population). (p. 25)

The long quotation above is informative and valuable for illustrating the different types of sources considered useful and reliable for determining the Roma population's size: "official data," "experts' estimates," and "other estimates." Under the heading of "experts' estimates," research institutes, governmental bodies, and scholars are included, while in the category of "other estimates," "Roma groups" as well as international and Roma NGOs are included. Although expert status is not mentioned in the case of the "other estimates" category, the data provided by NGOs are also considered reliable (at least more reliable than the census data).

It is interesting to observe that for the "experts' estimates" category, a reliable source for the UNDP policy experts appears to be the Ministry of Interior, as it is the case for Bulgaria. Not only the Ministry of Interior—which means police, more colloquially—is thought to be a more reliable source than the census, but also police estimates, as a legitimate source, are placed in the same category of scientifically produced estimates reflecting the number of Roma. The numbers provided by the Ministry of Interior have the same value of knowledge as those produced by sociologists, and thus both policemen and sociologists are acknowledged as experts.

In the long history of Roma enumeration, policemen and sociologists seem to have been standing side by side as enumerators. The Ministry of Interior, as a source of legitimate statistics about Gypsies/Roma in Bulgaria, is mentioned in the World Bank (WB) policy study from 2000 as well. In this study, the police as a source of statistical data about Roma is presented during the discussion about contrasting numbers between the census and estimates by police: according to the 1992 census, there were 313,326 Roma, and according to the 1989 Ministry of Interior estimate, there were 577,000 (World Bank 2000, 4). In the World Bank report, in order to make an argument about the unrealistically low number of Roma in the official census, the police estimate is credited with more accuracy than the office which provides the census data. Thus, for UNDP and WB policy reports the police is seen as a qualified institution to count Gypsies/Roma. Yet, the reports fail to even mention the ethical issue of ethnic data gathering by the police as if an infamous history of police-led censuses would not exist. Quoting data gathered by the police is problematic itself: there is no explanation of how the police

reach these numbers and what methods they have been using in the production of such numbers. Moreover, it is debatable whether the number of Roma estimated by the police should be acknowledged in scientific and policy-oriented publications.

Rather, one should go to the source of data provided by the influential UNDP and WB reports quoted above, which cite alternative estimates in order to historicize the sources of consensus on the Roma undercount by the census. One of the experts mentioned in both policy reports is Jean-Pierre Liègeois, a French sociologist and adviser of the European Commission. His estimates are the most often quoted in relation to the “real” number of Roma in Europe not only by scholars and political institutions, such as the Council of Europe, but also by mass media. Table 1 below compares population statistics for four European countries that are considered as having the highest number of Roma. The data in the table are provided by Liègeois at different intervals of time: first in 1983 (English edition in 1986), then in 1994, and lastly in 2007. The book *Roma in Europe* from 2007 is a second edition of the book *Roma, Gypsies, Travellers* from 1994, which is itself the second edition of the book *Gypsies and Travellers* from 1985 (Liègeois 2007, 11). Yet, data from 1994 and 2007 publications show the same numbers of Roma for the four countries considered (Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, and Spain), although an interval of thirteen years has passed between the two editions of the book.

It should be mentioned that in the first publication from 1983 (English edition in 1986), the numbers are provided without any reference to a source of data, not indicating the type of source (official or unofficial), neither in the text nor in the bibliography. The numbers in this publication, therefore, are pure numbers in the sense that no rationale is provided for their production. The only statement made by the author in the preamble of the displayed numbers is that they represent “a rough estimate of the total number of Gypsies in Europe” (Liègeois 1986, 47).

What can be observed at first sight is that Liègeois revised substantially his estimates between the two publications, an interval of eleven years (1983 and 1994), with the exception of Hungary where his 1994 estimate remained almost unchanged. He described his estimates as “merely indicative of the numbers,” suggesting that for a variety of reasons the real numbers could be in fact higher, and his

Table 1. Estimates of Gypsies/Roma 1983, 1994, and 2007 by Jean-Pierre Liègeois

	Bulgaria	Hungary	Romania	Spain
Estimates of Gypsies 1983	300.000–500.000	400.000–600.000	500.000–800.000	300.000–450.000
Estimates ¹⁸ of Roma/Gypsies and Travellers 1994 and 2007	700.000–800.000	550.000–650.000	1.800.000–2.500.000 ¹⁹	650.000–800.000

Sources of data: Liègeois 1986, p. 47, Liègeois 1994, p. 34, and Liègeois, 2007, p. 31.

estimates should be regarded as rather conservative. The most compelling reason that the author offers for the increase in the number of Roma is simply the growth of the Roma population that could be quantified by doubling the starting number every 20–30 years. In his own terms: “Firstly, strong natural population growth in Gypsy communities means that statistics compiled in a given year need to be revised upwards a few years later: in many countries the Gypsy population is liable to double within two or three decades” (Liègeois 2007, 31–32). It seems that the increase of Roma population in experts’ estimates follows, to a certain extent, the rule of thumb proposed by Liègeois. Returning to the figures in Table 1, the author does not explain how he used the rule of thumb when he produced the revised estimates, and why the general rule does not apply for all four countries considered. While the estimates for Bulgaria and Spain follow the rule of doubling the number of Roma, the numbers for Hungary remain relatively unaltered and in Romania they almost tripled. Since the numbers provided by Liègeois do not follow his own algorithm, one should search for alternative explanations regarding the assembly and production of Roma numbers.^{18 19}

¹⁸ The table with estimates in the 1994 edition is titled “Evaluation du nombre des Tsiganes et Voyageurs en Europe.” The table with population estimates in 2007 is untitled, but the reference in the whole chapter is to Roma/Gypsies and Travellers.

¹⁹ In the book from 2007 the size of the Roma population for Romania is revised to 2.400.000.

In the case of Bulgaria, it seems that Liègeois trusted the secret census conducted by the police rather than the public statistics of the census since the estimates of the police are close to those used by the author. Liègeois noted that the Bulgarian Communist Party revised the official numbers that were based on the census by ordering police censuses of Gypsies to be carried out two times, one after the 1975 census and another one in 1989:

The party authorities considered these statistics [official census] unreliable and, at their requests, a parallel census was carried out with participation by the Ministry of Interior. The results contained in a document dated 1980 that was kept secret at the time, put the Gypsy population at 524,000. A similar Interior Ministry census conducted in 1989 produced a figure of 576,000 persons, but spot checks carried out since then have indicated that these numbers fell far short of the reality. The fact is that a significant number of Gypsies in Bulgaria prefer to declare themselves as Turks or Romanians on census forms. (2007, 29)

Even more important is the question of what kind of police methods were used to inquire and sort people into ethnicities, and why these methods are to be considered as producing reliable figures. It is very likely that the special censuses of the police were done on visual inspection, sorting people as Gypsies or not. Possibly other methods of ethnic data gathering might have been included except for self-ascription, since the official earlier censuses were contested by experts for the very reason that self-ascription in the case of Gypsies is considered fraudulent. In the communist period, it is likely that police defined those who did not fit the expected socialist way of life as Gypsies, and also included in this category those living in impoverished conditions in slums and ghettos. It is also very likely that neither a sense of belonging nor cultural affinities were criteria for assigning Gypsies in police censuses.

In order to explain the disidentification of the Roma ethnicity, Marushiakova and Popov (2001b) advance the concept of “preferred ethnic awareness” in order to define the identification of “Gypsies” within their surrounding population: in a great number of cases, those classified as Gypsies in Central and Eastern Europe in time

have developed, under the influence of socio-historic, economic, and political factors, different identities related neither to a Gypsy group nor to Roma. The authors give a series of examples of ethnic identities that have emerged from the category of Gypsies: the group of Rudars (or Boyash) who assume a Romanian identity and speak the Romanian language or archaic forms of it, the Egyptians in Kosovo, Macedonia, and Serbia who aim for political recognition, and those self-identified as Askalia in Kosovo. Beyond these self-affiliations, in many cases those who were at times externally defined as Gypsies developed a civic awareness, a “feeling of belonging to the nations” that made them broadly affiliate as members of their nation states (Marushiakova and Popov 2001b, 43). The affiliations with other ethnicities come across linguistic lines (e.g., speakers of the Turkish language adopted a Turkish identity, Romanian language speakers adopted a Romanian identity, and so on.). Marushiakova and Popov (2001b) imply that the internal division and classifications of Gypsies are endorsed by the Gypsies’ representations of themselves. The authors claim that the new Roma elite with a nationalistic motivation tries to reunite all the disparate Gypsy groups under the same umbrella-term of Roma.

Yet, all these “preferred” ethnicities embraced by Gypsies are not impeding ethnographers in seeing and counting them broadly as Gypsies. By advancing the notion of “preferred identity,” Marushiakova and Popov (2001b) regard the externally imposed label of Gypsy as an appropriate label for group categorization. They consider censuses as undercounting Gypsies and assume that some of the Gypsies have in fact placed themselves in the wrong categories. Moreover, they advance an estimate of the undercount of Gypsies in the long anthropological and sociological tradition of estimating the “true” number of the Gypsies/Roma. As Liègeois before, they generally concluded for CEE countries: “We would say that the official statistical censuses reflect about one-third of the real number of Gypsies in each country. In some instances the discrepancies can be even more drastic” (Marushiakova and Popov 2001b, 35).

The issue of the Gypsies/Roma undercount appears to be very present in sociological thinking and has been constantly reproduced by social scientists of various branches. As I have shown, sociologists believe today, as in the past, that some “Roma” just want to pass as something else or simply not assume an ethnic identity. A recent policy

paper for example asserts that: “The number of Roma in the region cannot be established on the basis of population censuses because most of them have refused to identify themselves as such” (UNECE 2011, 2). This statement could be read as a leitmotif of policy and social science research in general, and it represents a symptomatic description for the Roma population. Almost any quantitative or policy study on Roma starts from a similar premise, which seems to be a very powerful cognitive frame that closes other ways to see and conceptualize Roma, relegating them to an essential and unchanging identity. This wide consensual point of view contradicts not only the fact that ethnicity is a matter of affinities and of free choice but, moreover, binds policy and social science research to an inflexible and not updated paradigm; meanwhile, this type of research distances itself from the very aim of conducting research. In the case of Roma, research outcomes are known from the outset.

5. REPRESENTATIVE SURVEY SAMPLES BUILT ON UNREPRESENTATIVE CENSUS DATA

In the last two decades, official ethnic statistics recorded in the censuses advanced slowly and reluctantly towards a social constructivist understanding of ethnicity. This movement was reflected in a series of “innovations” related to the measurement of ethnicity and race, as, for example, the “write free texts” questions in the recording of ethnicity, the possibility of multiple choices in regard to ethnicity and race, the abandonment of pre-determined lists of ethnicities, the extension of the number of officially recognized ethnic labels, and, more generally, the partial elimination of some of the external sources of constraint in regard to self-identification. In social theory related to ethnicity, when it is not simply rejected as being merely a social construct and consequently expelled from the realm of quantification, the academic community considers that ethnicity in quantitative research is a matter of uncertainty, which includes errors of measurement and methodological biases due to the conceptual or instrumental decisions of researchers. The main trade-off in ethnic classifications in censuses is that between the granularity of classifications (the level of details admitted in the self-assignment) and their utility (Aspinal 2009). In the construction of

classifications in censuses and surveys, the multiplication of categories and the option to choose from more boxes in a questionnaire provide a higher validity of ethnic constructs, while the reduction of categories through statistical aggregation strongly decreases the validity (until the output of statistical artifacts) and, eventually, increases the utility for policy-making. As I have presented previously in relation to the Roma ethnicity in the 2011 Romanian census, for the presentation of data it was preferred to aggregate nineteen granular labels (most of them occupational labels) into a single category, that of Roma, which arguably decreased the validity of Roma as an ethnic construct. In the case of Roma, the granularity of classifications was suppressed in favor of aggregation both by the census maker and by policy researchers.

Roma ethnicity measurement in censuses and surveys raises objectivity claims that rarely have been analyzed and doubted. Surprisingly, the social constructivist “innovations” that were accommodated in the general practice of the census did not find a place in surveys related to Roma. On the contrary, with very few exceptions, the quantitative research on Roma conceptualizes Roma ethnicity as a taken-for-granted, distinct and uni-dimensional identity, and most research methodologies use for Roma ethnicity a non-continuous variable that is seen in a binary opposition with non-Roma ethnicity. Moreover, research projects on poverty took Roma ethnicity as a standard for poverty measurement and contrasted it to non-Roma poverty, hence ethnicizing the social phenomenon of pauperization. Using the binary classification of Roma and non-Roma, most research projects on poverty (and related subjects) act to reinforce ethnicized identities at the expense of more nuanced views that trace similarities among different socially categorized groups. Research on Roma and poverty naturalize Roma poverty by equating Roma ethnicity with poverty, and therefore implying that (the main) characteristic of this ethnic group is poverty. Moreover, the binary classification, with the use of the composite category of Roma, acts to create a homogenous image of the people labeled as such and obscures differences among subsets of people inside of general Roma category.

The relationship between censuses and quantitative research on Roma, and the way the two are connected, is complicated and ambiguous. Intricacies arise from the fact that the validity of the census is contested in regard to the numerical size of Roma population, but at

the same time the census is also taken as an accurate descriptor of the profile of the Roma population because researchers build their samples based on census data. Researchers consider the census as an appropriate descriptor of the Roma population profile for variables such as demographic characteristics (age, gender, rural-urban distribution, the size of a typical Roma household, etc.). Although the census is held by researchers as an incomplete listing of an elusive, hidden, and hard to quantify Roma population, nevertheless there are census findings that are used in order to select Roma communities in the samples and further on to check the validity of research samples and their representativeness. In other words, quantitative research on Roma proceeds to the conceptualization of its population of study from a census considered unreliable, and yet uses this census for asserting the representativeness of its sample, which is based not on the list of Roma individuals taken from the census data, but on the aggregate characteristics of the Roma population enumerated in the census.

In statistics, a sample is considered representative when all the units of the universe of the study have been completely enumerated and listed, and from this comprehensive list a random selection of individuals is made. However, the list of Roma individuals as determined by the census is considered incomplete (hence the allegations of Roma undercount) and therefore highly inaccurate. Yet, samples drawn from an aggregate level (such as communities) and the usage of random selection in this incomplete list are considered good enough for representative Roma samples. In other words, the process of building representative samples of Roma starts from unreliable and incomplete census data, but the results obtained in quantitative research (based on census data) are considered representative for Roma population. If the census is considered inadequate for capturing the real number of the Roma population, then why are the Roma profile characteristics from census data used in surveys that are considered representative?

The basic presupposition on which quantitative empirical research operates is that a large segment of Roma hides its “true” identity and takes another ethnic identity for fear of discrimination or to associate themselves with a more prestigious ethnic group, usually the majority. According to this assumption, it appears that there are some objective markers that sort people into ethnicities, rather than preferences or a sense of belonging that are responsible for explaining ethnic self-affilia-

tion. The philosophy that considers that a part of the Roma population hides its real identity (becoming “false” majority members) thus denies the mere possibility that changes in self-affiliation may occur, and consequently posits Roma as an essential identity that cannot be changed by any means (such as interethnic marriages, social mobility, lifestyle or residential changes, or just simple adjustments in the personal, intimate sense of belonging). Even ethnicity, in theory at least, is a matter of choice, but for “Roma” who disaffiliated as Roma there is no such choice. What is implied is that Roma ethnicity cannot be regarded as situational, contextual, and fluid during a life course, or even intergenerational. For the “objectivist” researchers, people cannot change their affiliations even under the action of strong societal pressures of assimilation, as historically was the case with societal demands towards the assimilation of Roma. Affirming that many Roma hide their identity, the underlying philosophy of quantitative research assumes that people who changed their identities (or have multiple identities) and over time began to consider themselves part of the majority are not “true” majority members, but Roma in disguise, even if they have adopted the majority language and culture in their families and schools. The fear of discrimination could have made some people choose to change their ethnic affinities from Roma groups to other groups, but it is not the only factor. Ascribing to another identity by choice and by cultural practices should be permissible, and it should also be admissible to opt out of the Roma/Gypsy affiliation and associate oneself with new identities, if ethnicity is not seen as a biological category closer to race than to culture and cognition. The presumption often encountered in quantitative research (and in policy-making documents) about Roma is that “Roma” who choose another ethnic label in censuses in fact changed only their *reported ethnicity*. Moreover, the charge that people do not disclose their “true” ethnicity in the census amounts to reinforcing the legitimacy of census forms that record ethnicity in single and exclusive categories, which is the case of many CEE countries. Therefore, the implication of undercounting Roma is not that the census forms are exclusionary because they ask people to sort themselves into exclusive categories, but that people should feel attached to a single category and not to more. In sum, the purported reason for recording a lower-than-reality number of Roma people in the census is that some Roma hide their “true” identity, rather than accepting that

identities could change in time and in different contexts, or that the census fails to accommodate self-categorizations that fit real people and not statistical abstractions.

The consensus about the Roma undercount in a small academic community concerned with Roma is curious because the other consensus in a wider academic community is that ethnicity is a subjective individual issue, a matter of a feeling of self-belonging and a matter of cognition. Nevertheless, the academic consensus related to the undercounting of Roma mirrors consensual acceptances from other spheres (mass media, political representatives of Roma, Roma NGOs, and general public opinion). If ethnicity is subjective, the allegations—academic or not—of undercounting Roma are then rooted in the objectivist philosophy of Roma ethnicity. The assumption about the objective ethnicity of Roma, as implied by undercount presuppositions, equates with seeing Roma by their physical characteristics (such as skin color), hence indicating a racialized identity and not a self-ascribed one.

In producing Roma-related numbers, all parts involved (NGOs and representatives of international organizations, activists, politicians, journalists, researchers, etc.) present data about “Roma issues” in accordance with their interests. There is no doubt that big numbers around an issue attract more resources and more organizations and get more governments involved in solving the issue, so that in the construction of big numbers (and therefore, a big issue around it) there must be organizational interests acknowledged in securing funds for working on the issue they framed. Beyond the instrumental reason of attracting funds, in the production of big policy numbers there are also reasons such as promoting an organization, highlighting its importance, and increasing its popularity or, in other words, establishing its legitimacy. Framing Roma as a social problem is working to attract considerable resources, but unfortunately these resources did not translate into tangible benefits for the lives of Roma, as many policy analysts and Roma themselves acknowledged. Moreover, in the exercise of policy-making, labeling Roma as a social problem remains deeply trapped in the public consciousness, including Roma, amplifying their historically inherited stigma.

Chapter 5

Influencers of Academic and Expert Discourse about Roma

“There is nothing mysterious or natural about authority. It is formed, irradiated, disseminated; it is instrumental, it is persuasive; it has status, it establishes canons of taste and values; it is virtually indistinguishable from certain ideas it dignifies as true, and from traditions, perceptions and judgments it forms, transmits, reproduces. Above all, authority can, indeed must, be analyzed.”

(Edward Said)

1. A BIBLIOMETRIC APPROACH

This chapter explores the intricacies related to the multidisciplinary production of discourse about Roma within the realm of the scientific and policy-making fields. Accordingly, the questions guiding my endeavors are the following: Who is who in regard to the scientific and expert study of Roma? What particular branches of science contributed the most to shaping the field of what could be regarded as studies about Roma?¹ What are the main frames through which Roma are distinguished as an object of study?

¹ I use “studies about Roma” to refer to the category of all expert and scientific publications that have Roma as an object of study. As I define later on, Romani Studies is merely a particular sub-field of this broader field of studies about Roma.

Some clarifications should be made in regard to how I understand two important issues related to authorship. Building on my enterprise by using the word “actor” for designating the authorship of Roma-related publications, I cover two particular entities. The first entity is the individual author who publishes an academic text or a policy paper that uses a scientific methodology. The second entity is a corporate body, either an organization that publishes papers under a collective name or an organization that publishes works of individual authors under institutional auspices. A way to measure the influence that the published texts of these two types of actors exert on Roma-related discourse could be to account for the way in which subsequent knowledge production incorporates and refers to these already published texts. Although the influence of the texts about Roma is not limited to quotations and references between authors in a scientific field or across fields, this measure of academic influence remains the most traceable among all circulated references to Roma.

In order to establish the influence of scientific fields on discourse about Roma, I chose the Google Scholar search engine as a tool for mapping the scientific fields. Despite criticism that Google Scholar is less scholarly than other academic search engines, it is nevertheless acknowledged to be one of the largest academic databases and a good proxy for scanning a large body of both scientific and expert literature and therefore works well for my purpose. In fact, the discourse about Gypsies/Roma emerged predominantly as an expert discourse with different roles played by the same persons, either by scholars involved in policy-making or politicians/administrators who took on scholarly expertise. The ambiguous status of the expert role in scientific production is well assessed by Latour, who placed it at the intersection of scholarship, activism, politics, and administration:

The expert never was a coherent figure: neither a researcher, nor a political representative, nor an activist, nor an administrator in charge of the protocol of the experiment, but playing a bit of all those roles at once without being able to fulfill any one of them satisfactorily. The idea of the expert is a remnant from the trickle-down model of scientific production; he or she is a person in charge of mediating between the knowledge producers, on the one hand, and the rest of the society in charge of values and goals, on the other. (2011, 13)

In order to find the way in which Roma-related discourse is influenced and to disentangle how specific texts exert influence, I have performed a complex search with the software *Publish or Perish*² by using the following parameters:

- The word “Roma” with the operator “all of the words”;
- Year of publication: between 1990–2013;
- The operator “title words only.”

The software *Publish or Perish* works with the Google Scholar search engine but allows more specificity in the queries, as, for example, queries in the title words versus in the abstract of the paper, and allows for the use of time intervals in the queries. From the search I performed, a list of 1000 publications that have the word Roma in the title and that have been published in the selected period of reference (1990–2013) resulted. Incidentally, 1000 results is the in-built maximum number allowed by Google Scholar searches. Although the returned results omit some of the publications complying with the search parameters, it is generally acknowledged that the most important bibliometric parameters, such as h-index and g-index, are not affected by omissions. In other words, the returned list contains those publications that were most often cited. While there is criticism regarding the accuracy of the valid number of citations as returned by searches with Google Scholar (GS), nevertheless there is a wide agreement regarding the rank of a paper (or an author). The h-index and the GS rank (based on the number of citations) of a paper are among the most important estimates of the impact of academic publications.

The analysis that follows uses the GS rank for assigning the impact of publications referring to Roma. The most important sources of bias and hence the limitations of this analysis are related to the following issues:

- The inflation of results with publications that may not fit academic standards;
- The omission of some relevant results in the returned list due to the maximum allowed number of results (1000);

² Harzing, A.W. (2007) *Publish or Perish*, available from <http://www.harzing.com/pop.htm>.

- The omission of publications that have Roma as a topic but did not list the word Roma in the title;
- The absence of most of the publications in languages other than English.

However, despite these limitations, it is likely that the citation analysis using the methods described above provides an assessment of the most influential academic papers that likely have an impact on the discourse about Roma.

From the 1000 returned results, I further proceeded to disambiguation by eliminating those results from the list that had a different subject, as for example the city of Rome (Roma), which was the most often encountered and irrelevant result for my purpose. The disambiguation was done after evaluating abstracts of search results. Only publications in English³ were kept in the list, and I eliminated the few papers published in languages other than English from the results. After evaluating abstracts and dealing with duplicates,⁴ a final list of 251 publications⁵ resulted, ranging from a number of 196 citations per publication to a number of 2 citations per paper. The list of 251 papers, obtained by the methods described above, is the sample

³ First, the Google Scholar engine eliminates most of the non-English language publications. Second, keeping the few results in languages other than English would have distorted the results, as the criteria for selecting publications in other languages than English are not explicit. Third, in measuring the academic influence of authors and papers, I considered that English is currently the *lingua franca* for scientific and expert publications, and relevant for influence and prestige in the scientific and policy communities. Moreover, those publications in languages other than English that played an important role in shaping the scientific discourse about Roma are likely to have English translations and could be among the results of the search.

⁴ After disambiguation, I proceeded with solving the issue of duplications of the results, as some of the publications appeared two or more times under slightly changed titles or with authors' names spelled differently.

⁵ These 251 publications sorted by fields represent my sample of analysis built in March 2013. Since then, the number of citations increased. For example the first paper in my sample, a World Bank (2005) report with the title "Roma in an Expanding Europe," in March 2013 had 196 citations that increased to 260 citations in November 2014. Nevertheless, when specified, I mention the number of citations received by publications in March 2013.

used for the evaluation of academic and expert influences in constituting Roma as an object of study. However, Roma-related scientific and expert literature is far more prolific than these 251 titles, and the sample should be regarded as merely the tip of the iceberg for the flourishing topic of publications addressing Roma. Nevertheless, this sample of 251 papers is significant in measuring the influence in the field of Roma-related literature and in establishing trends. More importantly, many papers published in languages other than English are likely to follow the same frames, images, concepts, and recurring themes as those from the selected sample. Due to their high number of citations, the publications analyzed and their authors (or publishers) can be considered as the “founders of discursivity” (Foucault 1984d, 114) in relation to Roma-related topics.

2. INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF *ROMA* CATEGORY IN ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

The choice of the period after 1990 for my analysis has several reasons. The first one is the renewed interest in Roma as a topic from a segment of the academic community (and also from mass media), together with the interest from governments, non-governmental organizations, and intergovernmental bodies for elaborating policies addressing Roma. This academic and policy interest in Roma produced a large body of academic and expert publications with Roma as an object of study. The second, but no less important reason for choosing this reference period was to reveal how the construction of an ethnic category develops in a limited interval of time in which the task of tracing the sources of influence remains manageable. Considering a longer interval of time would make the task exceedingly difficult for a precise decomposition of actors influencing the production of an ethno-political category. Studies about Roma are a relatively large segment of the academic production, whose roots date back at least to the eighteenth century. I focus on the recent history of Roma-related studies because it coincides with the switch from the exonym Gypsy to one of the endonyms—Roma—due to political decisions taken by relevant policy actors, such as governments, international organizations, and Roma NGOs. Accordingly, following this change in the label of the group

means to follow the entanglements of studies about Roma in politics. Following in the footsteps of institutionalization of the new and politically correct Roma endonym in academic circles is useful because this change from the label Gypsies to that of Roma makes the constructed character of the category visible and highlights the way in which the academic community repositioned the new label vis-à-vis the old label. This process of an ethnic category construction is underlined by the inconsistencies in categorization that are proved by the simultaneous circulation of various names of the group.

In changing taxonomies in academic and policy discourse, the term “Roma” covers such a large scale of characteristics that it is hardly more than a collective umbrella for different entities and groups:

“Roma” is the term increasingly applied in academic and political discourse to a collection of communities that, both historically and today, have been known by a huge range of not necessarily exclusive names and which refer to a variety of different characteristics such as presumed origin (Gypsy), occupation (Lovari, Rudari), physical appearance (Kalo), lifestyle (travellers), culture (Romungre) or language (Beash). (Kovats 2001, 113)

The term Roma is applied to a political category, which emerged in the interplay between Roma organizations (mainly the International Roma Union—IRU) and bodies of the United Nations (UN) (Klímová-Alexander 2005). The current classifications, descriptions, and categorizations of Roma were developed over time as a result of Romani organizations seeking legitimacy and recognition in the context of certain frames allowed by the UN system. In this interplay, the framing perspectives of the Roma group were developed and mutually influenced by the interacting actors, namely Roma individuals and organizations, and the various branches of the UN system (*ibid.*).

The political usage of Roma-related appellatives can be also observed in Council of Europe (CoE) documents when following the transformation of the Gypsies-Roma category over time. The following list of appellatives is illustrative of the ambiguity and malleability of labels, as well as of the shaping and reshaping of group labels over time in order to conveniently frame a category from a political perspective:

The terminology used by the Council of Europe (CoE) has varied considerably since 1969, the date of the first text relating to the Roma communities: “Gypsies and other travellers,” “Nomads” (1975 and 1983), “populations of nomadic origin” (1981), “Gypsies” (1993), “Roma (Gypsies)” (1995), “Roma” (1997, 2002), “Roma/Gypsies” (1995, 1998, 2000), “Roma/Gypsies and Travellers” (2001), “Roma and Travellers” (between 2004 and 2010), and “Roma” since 2010. (CoE 2012, 3)

It is interesting to note that in the CoE quotation above, the political label Gypsies was used until 1995 and associated with the idea of nomadism, the two labels Gypsies and Roma were used simultaneously until the year 2001, either by using parentheses or slashes, and afterward the new Roma category was introduced to fully replace the old Gypsies label. When using the parentheses (in 1995), it is semantically suggested that the new Roma reference is made to the old Gypsies category. The slashes used in subsequent years indicate that although preference is given to the term Roma (because it came first), the word is, however, fully interchangeable with that of Gypsies. The importance of re-categorization by keeping the old label of Gypsies in circulation together with the new label of Roma is to be seen in light of maintaining coherence when informing the public about CoE political documents. However, the idea of nomadism, which emerged in 1975, has been recaptured in a new terminology so that in 2001, the old CoE categories of Nomads or “population of nomadic origin” came to be replaced by the term Travellers. It seems that the CoE needed about 35 years to renounce, at least in discourse and terminology, framing the group under nomadism.

For my analysis, which aims to emphasize the institutionalization of the Roma category in academic discourse, it is important to observe that for a political organization such as the CoE it took fifteen years to completely replace the category of Gypsies with that of Roma. The struggle to use the Roma or Gypsy categories was even longer for some national governments. For example, the Romanian government was asked as early as 1995 by the CoE and local Roma NGOs to change the word Gypsies, due to its pejorative connotation to that of Roma in official documents. The response to the request was negative, with the justification that the term Roma is too close to the term Romanian,

which designates the majority population, and the change will produce confusion between the two populations for the international community. Five years later, the (new) government changed its mind and the word Roma was accepted in Romanian official documents, as a result of similar conversations with international actors who had by that time already adopted the word Roma. However, the arguments regarding the name continued, and as late as 2010 a parliamentary resolution for changing the name again, this time from Roma back to Gypsies was introduced and not approved. It seems from the above stories that the Roma category was crafted primarily on political premises: “‘Roma’ is simply the political replacement for the generic identity ‘Gypsy’...” (Kovats 2003).

We may expect that the change of appellatives was even slower in the academic field due to the vast heterogeneity of the numerous fields of specialization and due to different approaches within the same fields. For example, in anthropology the term Gypsies is still largely in use and preferred by anthropologists and ethnologists, while in political science, the term Roma was adopted more easily. Although the change of the label Gypsies to that of Roma was requested by IRU at its first congress held in London in 1971, the request gradually gained acceptance beginning in 1990 (it is beyond the scope of this chapter to analyze this delay). The period from 1970 to 1989 could be seen as one of gradual institutionalization of the endonym Roma in public discourse with very few academic or expert papers using it. A Google Scholar query returned only fourteen papers using the word Roma in the title during the period from 1971 (the date of the political coinage of the category) to 1989. From these fourteen papers, nine refer to Germany and the Holocaust using the expression “Sinti und Roma,” probably for distancing from the sensitive appellative of “Zigeuner,” which is associated with Nazi atrocities. Three of the fourteen papers quoting Roma in the title (receiving only few citations) were all published in the journal *Roma*, an IRU publication that merged scholarship with ethnic activism. The editor of the *Roma* journal was Weer Rajendra Rishi, who beyond linguistic research and an academic career, also assumed an activist role and was the honorary president of the IRU, the organization that contributed to the political recognition of Roma as an ethnic minority group. Rishi’s article from 1976 is suggestively titled so as to indicate Roma origin: “Roma: The Panjabi

emigrants in Europe, central and middle Asia, the USSR, and the Americas.”

To sum up, the label of Roma started as an ethno-political category in political circles and has slowly been institutionalized in the scientific community’s discourse, including the work of scholars who also assumed the role of ethnic activists. This distinction between activism and scholarship is not evaluative: the papers written with an activist pathos could have the same value as those papers that lack this drive. After all, different types of activism, such as the passion for social justice, equality, freedom, or solidarity, stimulate the construction of social theories that are influential in the social sciences.

Through the analysis of influencers in academic and expert discourse on Roma, it could also be observed how the academic community reacts to the category of Roma as a newly created political object. This is not to say that Roma exist only as a political object, but the possibility for official self-assertion as Roma was created by a political decision dating back to 1971. Moreover, even the shape of certain characteristics of the Roma population was first conceived during interactions among political actors. The emergence of Roma as a category (and an ethnic group) was not a need felt at the grassroots level but a decision taken by political actors (many, if not most of them, non-Roma). Even nowadays a large group of people politically categorized as Roma do not have a self-understanding of this term, insofar as the number of people self-identified as Roma is relatively constant over time in censuses.

The period after 1990 is the most appropriate to study the institutionalization of the Roma category in academic discourse because during this time Roma were legally recognized as a national minority in Central and Eastern European countries. First, the reference to Roma as a category was sporadic between 1971 and 1989, and the academic field was slower than the political one in adopting the new label. Second, when the first reference was made to Roma instead of Gypsies, it occurred in the German context with the aim to introduce a distance from the murderous political decisions of the Nazi regime when academic categorizations played an important role. Third, the few academic papers that appeared in the period 1971–1989 in the Romani Studies category had a militant aim to acknowledge the denomination of the term Roma proposed by the IRU. The analysis

of the most influential academic and expert papers after 1990 could also provide an indirect assessment of the efficiency of the newly introduced Roma label to portray the group without the pejorative connotations associated with the Gypsies label. After all, the replacement of the label aimed to destigmatize a collective identity.

3. DISENTANGLING INFLUENCE

For analyzing the influence of different scientific and expert fields on the constitution of Roma as an object of scientific and policy research, I have assigned the 251 papers from the sample into categories of analysis by evaluating the abstracts of the papers in all cases and the full content of some. I devised the following five broad categories of analysis: Romani Studies, Public Policy, Social Sciences, Public Health, Genetics, and Legal Studies/Human Rights.

In the category of Public Policy, I included studies with topics such as poverty, welfare, employment, migration, health, housing, and education. The papers included in the Public Policy category are those that suggest recommendations for addressing the problems in the mentioned fields.

I classified into the Romani Studies category those papers, which either focus on or devote most attention to issues related to history, culture, language, music, ethnography, and Roma identity.

Social Sciences as a scientific field is the most eclectic category, encompassing papers from diverse subfields such as political science, sociology, anthropology, ethnography, and social history. Political science is the most often encountered subfield within the Social Sciences category among the papers in the sample.

Within the category of Public Health, I placed those papers that focus on the health status of Roma and acknowledge different factors influencing it. I excluded medical genetics papers from the category of Public Health, as I considered it would be more relevant to analyze these papers separately in a distinct category of Genetics. I included under the category of Genetics both papers related to medical genetics and population genetics in relation to Roma.

In the category of Legal Studies/Human Rights, I assigned those papers in which the primary approach to Roma as a group derives from

their legal status as a minority group with legal entitlements. The main focus of these papers is human and minority rights violations, and the main approach is antidiscrimination (although the antidiscrimination approach could be present or prevalent in the papers classified under other categories as well). Primarily papers that were published in the legal and human rights journals are placed in the Legal Studies/Human Rights category. Yet, when articles from human rights journals refer rather to narrowly defined issues, such as health, for example, the respective papers were placed in the Public Health category. I used a combination of considerations, namely journal profile and focus of the paper, that led to the decision regarding sorting papers into categories.

There is a high degree of overlap among categories due to the growing interdisciplinarity of the (social) sciences, and, as a consequence, some papers could stand in more than one category; for example, this is the case with some of the papers that could be regarded as Social Sciences, Romani Studies, and Public Policy at the same time. To avoid this overlap, I evaluated the papers in relation to their main focus (resulting from the abstract or from the whole paper) and decided on their assignment to a certain category in accordance with it. For example, those papers that make policy recommendations (for governments, NGOs, or international organizations) and are published by a policy-making organization were placed in the category of Public Policy, even though these papers could contain sociological analyses, references to Roma history, culture, language, and identity, or may have a human rights approach. I concluded that the primary aims of such papers were to directly contribute to policy formation, and consequently, the existence of policy recommendations in these papers was used as a key for assessment, irrespective of the interdisciplinary character of the papers. Less ambiguous for categorization, but no less interdisciplinary, as many of the genetics papers also draw from ethnography, Romani studies, social sciences, or public policy data, are those papers within the category of Genetics that rely on medical sciences and biological laboratory analyses.

The next step in sorting the papers into categories was to classify them into two broad fields—*academic* and *expert*. The selection of papers into academic vs. expert categories took into account the type of publisher and the type of journal (in the case of articles) as the main criteria. In this regard, if publishers were well-known academic publishing

houses or editors affiliated with universities,⁶ and if journals were scientifically peer reviewed, I considered all these cases as academic publications. Expert publications were sorted by the type of publisher, such as an international organization or a transnational political body (e.g., Council of Europe, World Bank, European Commission, OSCE, UNICEF, OSI, ERRC). In the category of expert publications, I also added those papers that were published in open expert platforms, such as Open Democracy, The International Debate Education Association, Social Science Research Network, Migration Information Source, and so on. Accordingly, all papers from the Public Policy category were assigned to the field of expert publications, as well as a few papers from Romani Studies and Legal Studies/Human Rights that were assessed by content and publisher (non-academic publishers or expert platforms).

As with any other classification, this one has the limitation of partially overlapping with the categories that I proposed for sorting out the papers in the sample, and suffers from conceiving the categories in exclusive terms. To a certain extent, this categorization follows the lines imposed by the disciplinary divisions of scientific disciplines themselves. However, the classification is relevant for disentangling the influence of different academic disciplines in shaping a field of study that makes Roma a central object of scientific and expert interest.

From the sample of 251 publications, following the proposed division (academic and expert papers), a number of 194 papers (77.3%) could be framed as academic publications and the remaining 57 papers (22.3%) as expert papers. The total number of citations for all papers in the sample was 5419, and the average number of citations per paper was 21.6. These measures indicate a substantial interest from the scientific and expert fields in Roma as a subject of study. With the purpose of orientation but without aiming at direct comparisons (due to different time intervals, different sets of papers, etc.), the values of citations per paper⁷ for the field of social sciences (related to all subjects

⁶ For example Oxford University Press, Elsevier, Cambridge University Press, Routledge, Taylor & Francis, Central European University Press, and University of Hertfordshire Press.

⁷ According to Thomson Reuters's "Essential Science Indicators" cited by *Times Higher Education* at the following address: <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/415643.article>.

and not only to Roma) in the period 2000–2010 could be suggestive. According to Thomson Reuters, for social sciences the average number of citations for an article in 2000 was 9.25 and the average across the ten years was 4.67. It could be tentatively concluded that Roma as a subject of study was a hot topic in the social sciences after 1990, insofar as the social sciences in relation to Roma in my sample have 21.33 citations per paper.

The academic papers from my sample score a mean of 21.4 citations per paper (std. dev. is 21) in a range from 2 to 140, while for the expert publications the mean of citations is 22.1 (std. dev. is 36) and the range of citations is from 4 to 196. It could be observed that the average number of citations scored by academic and expert papers is quite similar, but the variability of citations is considerably higher for the expert publications. The difference in the number of citations is more noticeable among expert papers than academic papers, with some publications recording a considerably high number of citations and some others just a few citations. Moreover, the outliers in the sense of highly cited papers are more robust and numerous for the expert publications category. Thus, there are more influential papers to be found among the expert publications, and it implies that these papers heavily contribute to setting the trend of the discourse on Roma.

Table 2 below summarizes the scientific and expert interest in Roma as an object of study (and of policy-making as well) using two important measures: the number (percentage) of papers with citations per category/discipline and the average number of citations per paper in each category/discipline. I used these two measures in order to create two rankings among the disciplines considered. Both types of ranking are measures of influence within and across categories/disciplines.

The rank referring to the percentage of the total citations gives a measure of the importance of a specific category/discipline to the constitution of the broader field of studies about Roma. This rank could be regarded as a measure of the prolificacy or *productivity* of a specific discipline in relation to the quantity of Roma-related published papers. The rank of average number of citations per paper describes the *efficiency* of each discipline within the field of studies about Roma to which it is a contributor. The table should be read with caution given the fact that efficiency as reflected in the number of citations differs

Table 2. Number of papers and average citations per paper by category

Disciplines	Number (%) of papers	Average citations per paper	Rank by average citations per paper (efficiency)	Number (%) of total citations	Rank by % of total citations (productivity)
Social Sciences	102 (40.6%)	21.33	4	2176 (40.15%)	1
Legal Studies / Human Rights	31 (12.4%)	12.16	6	377 (6.95%)	6
Public Policy	36 (14.3%)	25.11	2	904 (16.68%)	2
Public Health	38 (15.1%)	18.78	5	714 (13.17%)	3
Genetics	18 (7.2%)	34.44	1	620 (11.44%)	5
Romani Studies	26 (10.4%)	24.15	3	628 (11.58%)	4

largely across scientific fields (e.g., Genetics as a discipline acquires in general a larger number of citations compared with other sciences). Even with this caution, efficiency (the rank of average number of citations per paper) captures the contribution of each discipline to the broad field of studies about Roma.

Social Sciences contribute the most to shaping academic discourse about Roma with 102 papers from 251 in the sample. Within the Social Sciences field by evaluating abstracts and contents, 40 papers were sorted as being primarily political science texts. Hence, the field of political science provides an important input to the construction of Roma as an object of study. The main topics addressed in the field of political science include the following:

- Roma ethnic identity construction and ethnic mobilization;
- Roma situation in post-communism as a result of system change in (Central and) Eastern Europe;
- Roma activism, the Roma movement, political representation and participation, Roma NGOs;
- Minority rights;
- Roma migration;
- European Union policy towards Roma.

Within the Social Sciences category, other active subfields are anthropology, sociology, social history, and ethnography. Specific topics developed in these subfields are exclusion and discrimination, the Holocaust, marginalization, poverty, education, employment, Roma representation in the media, and the social construction of Roma ethnicity or identity.

Within the Public Health category, papers with the highest occurrence are those that address the topic of socio-economic factors, which influence the general health status of Roma. When considering specific illnesses approached in the Public Health papers from the sample, the main subject is HIV incidence and sexually transmitted diseases among Roma. Other illnesses that are discussed in relation to Roma fall in the category of contagious diseases, such as varicella or measles, TBC, and hepatitis. When not addressing contagious diseases, papers in the sample approach topics such as unfavorable birth outcomes of Roma mothers, child mortality, cultural factors affecting health, nutritional status, smoking, and vaccination. The main concern of papers addressing Roma health is contagious diseases that may put the non-Roma population at risk through contact with Roma people, and such papers portray Roma as a risk group for public health. These findings resulting from my sample are consistent with Hajioff and McKee's study, which contains a meta-analysis of the Medline database on publications related to Roma health: "Much literature concentrates upon communicable disease or reproductive health. . . . The topics that have received attention suggest a focus on concepts of contagion or social Darwinism, indicating a greater concern with the health needs of the majority populations with which they live" (2000, 864). Although the content analysis of Hajioff and McKee (2000) takes into account the period 1966–1999, my updated analysis for the period 1990–2013 shows that not many things have changed in relation to the main concern of academics and experts about contagious diseases among the Roma population. The image of Roma as a group carrying contagious diseases has as a consequence the public perception of Roma as a threat to the health of the majority population. This type of medical paper may strengthen the attitudes trying to avoid Roma in public contexts and may encourage segregationist behaviors. When combined with the issue of Roma migration, which is a highly debated topic of research in recent years in media and political circles, this type of

paper and the arguments put forward (which at a first glance seem to be purely medical) reinforce the rejection of Roma individuals and prevent their acceptance in Western European countries where some migrate from Central and Eastern Europe.

In the Public Policy category, most of the papers comprise the domains of the Roma Decade of Inclusion and diagnose the situation of Roma in the fields of education, employment, health, and housing. Roma discrimination appears as a common theme in many of the public policy papers. The most influential papers, published by the World Bank, focus on Roma poverty. The second major topic in public policy papers is education, while other specific subjects are related to Roma migration in the context of EU enlargement and the EU funded programs for Roma integration/inclusion.

Academic discourse owes its focus on the origins, history, language, ethno-cultural identity, and religious diversity of Roma to the Romani Studies subfield. Many Romani Studies papers included in the sample discuss the exoticization of Roma in mainstream culture and the stereotyped construction of Roma *otherness* in literature, art, film, and music. Some of the papers account for Roma music as an essential part of the group's culture. Another topic frequently discussed in the Romani Studies field is the genocide of Roma during the Second World War.

Legal Studies include papers discussing topics of human and minority rights protection, police abuse in Roma communities, ethnic profiling, interethnic conflict, citizenship and statelessness, house evictions in Central and Eastern Europe and the expulsion of Roma from Western Europe, and political representation and participation. In general, the papers assigned to the Legal Studies category emphasize various violations of minority and human rights in regard to Roma.

As analyzed in depth through a case study in the next chapter, papers in the Genetics category are subdivided further in two interrelated subcategories: human population genetics and medical genetics.

4. WHO IS WHO IN EXPERT DISCOURSE ABOUT ROMA

For gaining success and scholarly recognition, not only the content and the author are important, but also the publisher. For the next level of analysis, examining the influence exerted in the field of studies about

Roma, I am first interested to find who the most significant players are among corporate and non-academic publishers who largely shape academic discourse (with the highest number of citations). After reviewing the “who is who” list in the field of academic and expert publishers of studies about Roma, my next step is to evaluate the frames used for describing Roma by these publishers. A publication included in

Table 3. Non-academic publishers’ ranking by number of papers and citations

Rank by number of citations	Organizations	Number of papers	Number of citations	Average citations per paper
1	World Bank	5	393	78.6
2	Council of Europe	3	170	56.6
3	Minority Rights Group	4	163	40.7
4	European Roma Rights Centre	14	131	9.3
5	European Commission	3	82	27.3
6	Project on Ethnic Relations	1	73	73
7	Open Society Institute	6	67	11.1
8	UNHCR	1	44	44
9	OSCE	2	40	20
10	Open Democracy	1	36	36
11	UNDP	3	26	8.6
12	Roma Education Fund	3	22	7.3
13	UNICEF	1	20	20

an academic database such as Google Scholar, even if the publisher is non-academic, increases its chances of being considered, reviewed, and cited by members of the academic community. Papers published by non-academic publishers have been often produced by scholars or mixed teams of scholars and policy experts. Table 3 below ranks non-academic publishers of Roma-related papers according to the number of papers, number of citations scored by their papers, and the average number of citations per paper.

The World Bank (WB) is the most cited non-academic publisher of papers related to Roma, and it leads both in regard to the general number of citations and the average number of citations per paper. Accordingly, it could be asserted that WB publications are *par excellence* the vectors that shape the image and contours of Roma representation for the expert community, and by extension for the academic community. Although the number of cited papers published by the WB is relatively small (five, to be exact), the organization published papers with the largest number of citations (393) compared with all other organizations that published on this topic after 1990. The influence of WB papers on academic discourse about Roma is not due to its prolificacy as a publisher, but rather to the attention received by its publications; the average number of citations per paper (78.6) confirms this fact. Such a high average score of citations per paper indicates the authority and legitimacy acquired by the WB in the field of Roma-related publications.

Similar to the World Bank, the Council of Europe (CoE) has a high number of citations (170) from a small number of papers (3). However, from the three papers in the sample published by the CoE, the book titled *Roma, Gypsies, Travellers* (Liègeois 1994) received 154 citations. The most quoted aspect in relation to this book is the Roma population's size, a piece of information taken up both in expert and academic discourse.

From the four cited papers published by the Minority Rights Group International, the article "Roma/Gypsies: A European Minority" (1995) received 132 citations and gained high visibility in Roma-related academic discourse. This publication is relevant for the new conceptualization of Roma as a European minority, and especially, for repeating the estimate of the Roma population's size. It is important to note that the excellent reception of the paper is also due to the epistemic

authority of its writers. Jean-Pierre Liègeois is a well-established scholar in the field of studies about Roma; additionally, he held advisory positions within European institutions that legitimated him as an expert. Nicolae Gheorghe has been a scholar who published on the Roma topic since the 1980s, and, as an active member of the Roma movement (associated with IRU), was fully engaged in the process of Roma recognition by international institutions.

The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) is highly productive, considering its number of quoted papers (14), although its impact on the academic discourse appears to be rather moderate. ERRC has a total number of quotations that is three times lower than that of the World Bank (the leader of the expert group of publishers). The average citations per paper of the ERRC is close to 9, which is a rather low number considering that Roma issues are regarded to be their foremost mission. In the case of Open Society Institute (OSI), although the institution has been active on topics related to Roma since the beginning of the 1990s, its impact on academic discourse is somewhat low, with only 67 citations from 6 papers.

Papers produced by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) do not attract much attention for scholarly work, as the UNDP is placed in a low position on the scale of influence on academic discourse about Roma. Taking into account that the UNDP invested and conducted several national, regional, and European field researches on Roma, its impact on academics as measured by the quoted papers is modest, having only 26 quotations from 3 papers.

Although influential in policy circles, the European Commission (EC) as a publisher has a relatively low impact on shaping academic discourse on Roma. Its influence is far lower than that of the World Bank, although the latter is comparatively a late entrant into the Roma discourse and policy field. The European Commission has been starting to produce expert discourse about Roma since 1970 (Simhandl 2006). By contrast, the first research report of the WB dedicated to Roma appeared three decades later, in the year 2000. This large difference in reception by academics of the two organizations' papers suggests *inter alia* that the WB is more trusted as a source of scholarly information, while the EC publications are eventually seen as administrative and political literature, despite the fact that the EC has long established itself as an actor in the field.

Institutions and organizations such as the UNHCR, OSCE, REF, and UNICEF have limited influence and visibility among academic publications, and consequently contribute less to opinion making in the academic community. Nevertheless, the research and publications of these institutions are more likely to influence expert discourse of the dominant actors, which is in turn reflected in academic papers. In other words, research reports and papers published by these organizations might prove to have an influence on the European Commission's or World Bank's general discourse on Roma. There is a rather closed policy community of such organizations where seminars, workshops, conferences, and different types of meetings occur that may provide the occasions for the exchange of opinions.

The impact of a publication and its influence on the academic community seem to be related to the academic or political authority of the publisher and also to that of the author(s). In some cases, it is the efficiency of the dissemination strategy of a publication (including free availability on the Internet) that is important for a high citation score. In other cases, the content of the paper and its potential to bring new viewpoints on the topic are the factors that ensure a favorable reception of papers by scholars. It is a combination of the above-mentioned factors that compete to establish influence, yet sometimes the authority of the publisher plays the most important role in making a publication visible for academic discourse. The example of Jean-Pierre Liègeois, who has been a consultant on Roma issues for the European Commission for about 20 years, and also served as the director of the *Centre de Recherches Tsiganes* (Centre for Gypsy Research) at the Université Paris Descartes, is illustrative of how the influence of a publication gets established.⁸ On the one hand, his book *Roma, Gypsies, Travelers* from 1994, which was published by the Council of Europe Press, obtained a very high score of 154 citations. On the other hand, another book of his, *School Provision for Ethnic Minorities: The Gypsy Paradigm* from 1998, which was published under the auspices of the University of Hertfordshire Press, reached 47 citations. It can be observed that Liègeois' publication with an academic publisher has considerably less

⁸ See Simhandl (2006) for an analysis of the influence of Jean-Pierre Liègeois on the discourse and policies of the institutions.

citations than his publication with a non-academic publisher. Paradoxically, it appears that a scholar is better received in the academic field when he or she is associated with a political publisher rather than with an academic one. Perhaps the impact of a publication is constructed by a dialectic relation between the authority of the publisher and the reputation of the author, but it is liable also to the content of the publication. The highly quoted publication of Liègeois under the aegis of the CoE is also relevant in providing the size of the Roma population for the first time after WWII in Europe. The fact that Liègeois provided the number of Gypsies/Roma in Europe (even though this is an undocumented estimate, as I presented in the previous chapter) and published this estimation with the CoE makes his publication from 1994 quotable and reputable in the scientific field (including genetics).

Political organizations, such as the CoE or the WB, have more leverage on academic discourse than traditional academic publishers, such as universities or research institutes. The roles of academics and experts become intermingled, and the border between academic and expert discourses is becoming permeable and difficult to trace. Academic discourse borrows from the discourse of expert or political organizations and legitimates it as scholarly work. These interchangeable roles of academic and expert fields are seemingly not perceived to be in conflict; on the contrary, both fields contribute to reinforcing governmentality (in Foucauldian terms) in the new management of the Roma population. The ivory tower of science resembles more and more the *panopticon* of the power-of-the-day institutions.

Chapter 6

Case Studies on Roma-related Discourse

“... If you say the same thing over and over
a great many times, it becomes true in the end.”

(Oscar Wilde)

For a further and in-depth investigation of Roma representation, as will follow in the next four case studies, it is important to keep the issue of framing in mind. The concept of the frame of reference (or simply frame) and its correlative of the trade-off (Knorr-Cetina 1983, 1991) are useful tools for understanding and analyzing academic and expert knowledge production. The strategy of framing is commonly applied in various scientific epistemic cultures as a scientific practice for producing evidence (as well as a validation procedure), and constructed within particular research traditions of a certain scientific discipline (Knorr-Cetina 1991). An example of divergent research traditions within the same field (that of the social sciences) is when in anthropology the preferred method is participant observation while in applied sociology the more often used method is that of quantitative survey. Framing in the production of scientific and expert knowledge is selective in regard to the language used, images, methods, approaches, and references. In the following case studies, I highlight this selectivity in scientific and expert papers during the construction of Roma representations.

The strategy of framing applies both to scientific and common knowledge, being *de facto* a cognitive process of simplification and organization of complex information in everyday life. Goffman (1974) uses the concept of frame for asserting that knowledge should be understood as

situational, and that production and circulation of frames is responsible for the organization of our experience. The application of frames to social reality and the usage of frames in public communication answer to ubiquitous collective expectations. The primary framework, which “allows its user to locate, perceive, identify, and label” is for Goffman a “schemata of interpretation” (1974, 21), which makes particular events or a class of events recognizable and meaningful. Frames are devices used to narrow down a class of events or entities to their most typical representations; frames are not specific to scientists or experts involved in knowledge production but to human cognition in general.

As Kahneman and Tversky (2000, 2002) demonstrate through experimental studies, people search to reduce uncertainty by the use of strategic heuristics that diminish the complexity of the world, but, unavoidably, produce biases in representation. The most frequently used cognitive heuristics are those of *representativeness*, *availability*, as well as *anchoring and adjustment*. The heuristic of representativeness assesses the probability of an entity (object, person, event) to be part of a larger class or set of entities. The availability heuristic refers to the ease with which certain examples (or sets of examples) are recalled in memory. Anchoring and adjustment are frequently used as strategies of reducing uncertainty by focusing on pre-existing numeric estimates of a class of entities or events. Below I mention some of the biases relevant to my analysis of Roma representations and advanced by the interdisciplinary work of scholars in cognitive psychology (Kahneman and Tversky 2000, 2002):

- Insensitivity to sample size and the illusion of validity;
- Errors due to familiarity or prominence when recalling examples from memory;
- Ease of access to particular sets of data because those data are vividly described;
- Errors due to the limits of imaginability;
- Illusory correlation;
- Invisible correlation.

Biases in categorization and judgment are common for all people (researchers included) and come into view in all circumstances. There are many descriptions of Roma in academic papers based on sample techniques considered random and representative, but very few sam-

ples are in fact random. Especially when the population cannot be (statistically) defined, which is the case for Roma, hardly anyone can claim randomness. Moreover, often the vivid cases of Roma are presented as typical cases by fully using the illusory correlations between ethnicity and social pathologies (such as poverty and deviance, among others). The bias resulting from anchoring heuristics is encountered in many circumstances when estimated numbers of Roma are overused and thus become a scientific routine for many researchers who may consider and treat these numbers as accurate.

Cognitive literature is an important source of inspiration for interdisciplinary work concerned with ethnic categorization as an object of study: ethnicity is best understood as a frame produced by social cognition (Brubaker, Loveman, and Stamatov 2004). Taking into account the specific limitations of human cognition, a new approach is suggested for understanding and speaking about ethnicity as a collective scheme of interpretation of life experiences: "Cognitive perspectives suggest treating ethnic, racial and national groups not as substantial entities but as collective cultural representations, as widely shared ways of seeing, thinking, parsing social experience, and interpreting the social world" (Brubaker, Loveman, and Stamatov 2004, 45). The insights from a cognitive approach are useful for a reconceptualization of ethnicity as an object of study in general, and Roma ethnicity in particular. It should not be forgotten that frames are sometimes instrumental and deliberately produced for epistemic reasons, such as conforming to a well-established tradition in a scientific discipline. The use of frames is also related to an interest-based model of science (Bourdieu 1975; Knorr-Cetina 1983, 1991)¹ in which epistemic interests, as a type of internal motivation for research production, are hardly separated by extrinsic motivation related to more mundane aspects, such as that of gaining scholarly recognition and legitimacy, which in turn allow the access to prestige, networks, and resources.

In addition to the considerations above, expert publications about Roma should face the constraints of representing Roma within organizational boundaries defined by the mission and object of activity of the organizations/institutions that perform discourse about Roma. For

¹ See also Chapter 1 in this book.

example, it would be out of their frame for an organization dealing with poverty to speak of Roma other than the poor. Therefore, representations of Roma that have been produced are limited by the perspectives laid down by different organizational mandates: poverty in the case of the WB, development in the case of the UNDP, nation-states and nationalities for the CoE, ethnic minorities for Minority Rights Group, migrants and refugees for the UNHCR, and so on. In light of understanding ethnicity as a cultural representation (Brubaker, Loveman, and Stamatov 2004), classifications and descriptions of Roma found in the papers produced by the above organizations can be also understood as specific products of organizational cultures. Thus, the investigation of Roma representations in expert publications is meanwhile also an inquiry into organizational cultures that produce a certain type of Roma representation.

Frames and framing strategies in relation to Roma are not merely produced as a result of scientific or expert activity, which answers to political or collective requests of typification; they are also a result of scholarly affiliations or allegiances with social movements such as the Roma movement. As I argued previously, the introduction of Roma as a category in academic and policy discourse was accompanied by a production of publications written by scholars who were also activists in the Roma movement. As with any social movement, the Roma movement makes an intense use of identity framing, and most often the frames used are subsumed by the idea of stressing the commonalities of problems encountered by Roma as an ethnic group (Vermeersch 2006).

In the production of knowledge, frames are related to trade-offs in the same way as heuristic strategies are connected to biases in cognitive judgments and categorization. It is unavoidable that frames are producing trade-offs in the same way as heuristic judgments necessarily produce errors. In the production of scientific truth, framings and trade-offs are in fact two closely related strategies (Knorr-Cetina 1991). The trade-offs are the compromises that deviate from an ideal standard done by the scientist when specific practices of searching for evidence are chosen (e.g., research methods and techniques). The constraints that lead to trade-offs result from limited resources, such as time, money, or other “external” factors: if there was more time, then more countries would be considered; if there was more money

available, then more people would be researched; and if there was no constraint by the organizational mission, then other topics would be examined. Sometimes in Roma-related studies these methodological limitations are mentioned vaguely or briefly, yet in most of the cases there are no methodological descriptions (especially for expert publications), and accordingly no acknowledgments of research constraints and limitations. I refer to the trade-offs implied by all of the aforementioned limitations, resulting from the biases of human cognition, divergent political interests, various organizational mandates and cultures, or different strategies of truth production by scientific and expert methods (such as sampling strategies, for example), in order to explain the bounded set of representations of Roma.

In the four case studies to be presented, I look further at the strategies of scientific and expert knowledge production that shape representations of Roma, the frames used for producing these representations, as well as the trade-offs associated with research practices. The first case study is linked to the most important expert papers that received the highest number of quotations in the 251-paper sample. As such, this case study is exemplary for analyzing the influence of expert literature in setting up the field of study about Roma after 1990. The second case study explores expert literature further by showing how the representation of Roma as a welfare dependent group was both constructed and deconstructed through the contribution of international organizations such as the UNDP and the World Bank. The third case study addresses the relatively recent developments for an entire subfield from my sample, that of genetics papers about Roma. I chose the discipline of Genetics because it was the most efficient when considering the average number of citations from all scientific disciplines represented in the sample. This case study is an example of how a scientific subfield establishes scientific dominance by importing concepts and basic assumptions from other fields. Finally, the fourth case study is based on a single scientific paper at the border of psychology, genetics, and public health, which exemplifies the potential of scientific classifications to stigmatize the Roma group, although it is a singular topic in the sample, and the consequences that scientific classificatory practices may have for the lives of real people. In this case, the consequence was legitimizing the segregation of Roma children into schools for pupils with mental deficiencies.

1. RECYCLING FRAMES IN WORLD BANK PUBLICATIONS (CASE STUDY 1)

As a result of the highest number of citations received, but also due to its influence in the policy community, the World Bank (WB) has an important role in defining Roma. In the following pages, my aim is to analyze three of the five WB publications that acquired the highest citation scores and to observe the ways in which Roma have been framed in these influential publications. The WB's most cited publications on Roma instantiate the formation of Roma-related representations not only for the expert discourse as a whole, but also for the papers sorted in the category of Public Policy.

The first WB study from 2000 obtained 113 citations and appeared under the title *Roma and the Transition in Central and Eastern Europe: Trends and Challenges*. The second report, which acquired a number of 52 citations, was printed in 2002 with the title *Poverty and Ethnicity: A Cross-country Study of Roma Poverty in Central Europe*. The third WB report was published in 2005 entitled *Roma in an Expanding Europe: Breaking the Poverty Cycle*. This last paper received 196 citations, thus it occupies the first place among the total number of 251 expert and academic papers from my sample. After 2005, there were no other papers related to Roma published by the World Bank comparable to the previous publications' influence on the academic and expert discourse about Roma. Although the WB reports have individual authors (see the list of references), it is likely that they are perceived as institutional studies that are regarded, read, and quoted as WB publications.

Starting with the second report, it is visible just from reading its title that poverty is the main frame of reference in regard to Roma. Another change is also easily noticeable in the geographical framing of Roma: from Central and Eastern Europe to Europe, and hence Roma in all of Europe and Roma poverty become the main issues in framing Roma.

Cultural frames

The 2000 WB report makes a brief tour of Roma culture and frames Roma as an ethnic group. Although the paper notices the huge diversity of Roma (in terms of language, self-identification, religious affili-

ation, occupations), nevertheless, a common and reluctant-to-change Roma culture is considered as widely shared by these diverse populations. Roma culture seems to transcend countries' borders, and it seems to be a monolithic and autonomous entity detached from local cultural influences and completely deterritorialized from its proximate environment. Moreover, in the short overview of the WB report, Roma culture is considered partially responsible for Roma poverty: "However, it is clear that aspects of Roma social organization and values affect the interactions of Roma and non-Roma, the dynamics among Roma subgroups, and *many aspects of their welfare*" (2000, 7; emphasis added). Although the section concerning culture is more developed in the report from 2005 compared with 2000, the 2005 report repeats verbatim the paragraph from the previous publication about the alleged role of Roma culture in generating poverty: "However, it is clear that aspects of Roma social organization and values affect the interactions of Roma and non-Roma, the dynamics among Roma subgroups, and many aspects of their welfare" (WB 2005, 11). Neither the 2000 nor the 2005 report explain what exactly "Roma social organization" is, or how this supposedly shared cultural particularity of the Roma group relates to (the lack of) Roma welfare. The above quotes are just a few of the many examples of paragraphs that are transferred with little or no change from one study to another in order to compile the section titled "Culture." The report also associates the aversive attitude of Roma towards school education with Roma culture: "Roma may be reluctant to participate fully in education because of fear of losing their cultural identity" (2000, 7). This alleged aversion of Roma to formal education appears very slightly changed in the consecutive WB study: "Roma may be reluctant to send their children to state schools because of fear of losing their cultural identity" (2005, 12). Yet, this small semantic change—from Roma being reluctant to *fully* participate, to Roma being reluctant to send their children to school—depicts Roma culture in an even harsher manner.

Roma-related cultural aspects are also presented in the WB 2000 and 2005 reports in the "Housing" sections, not just in the section addressing the culture. For example, the precarious living conditions of Roma are attributed, at least in part, to the "cultural preferences" of Roma. In this regard, the 2000 WB report states: "Cultural pref-

erences of Roma communities affect conditions within Roma settlements, although it is difficult to generalize” (14). Although the inference is difficult to generalize, it did not prevent such a statement from being made. Moreover, the study uses “common impressions” and not “cold” statistics (usually preferred by WB studies) to affirm that “Roma do not take sufficient care of their dwellings and surroundings.” Using just a single source as evidence, the WB 2000 report further implies that the few public housing programs for Roma failed because “some Roma groups have *taboos* against having adjoining kitchen and toilet facilities” (Pavis 1998, 14, quoted in WB 2000; emphasis added). Because of these supposed cultural taboos, “inhabitants have had little interest in the maintenance and upkeep of the buildings” (ibid.). This only source (cited for expressing Roma taboos against having adjoining kitchen and toilet facilities) of the WB paper is a draft narrative report of one of the organization’s grantees, as can be seen from the report’s list of references.

In the 2005 report, the same “cultural preferences of Roma communities” (37–38) are brought in to explain the poor housing and living conditions of Roma, using identical words, albeit this time without reference to any previous source. It seems that during the five years between the two WB reports, Roma cultural taboos related to improper housing maintenance became common knowledge. In the “Housing” section, the accent is put on traditional Roma culture that prevents the success of public housing programs, and not on structural issues such as the general scarcity of housing programs after 1990 in analyzed countries, nor on the fact that social housing, when provided, is less likely to be accessed by those with the most urgent need (due to corruption and political clientelism). Moreover, when discussing social housing programs, the WB reports neglect to mention that the few programs targeting Roma have reinforced segregation by moving Roma to the outskirts of cities with improper living conditions and little connection to public infrastructure (roads, utilities, networks of schools, and hospitals).

Moving from the “Housing” to the “Health” section, in the WB 2000 report, “cultural factors” are given even more prominence when describing attitudes of Roma towards the health care system, and the reluctance of Roma to visit doctors and follow up with medical treatment. In this regard, the report notes another set of alleged Roma

taboos: “There are indications that beliefs affecting health care are prevalent among some Roma, for example, *taboos* against screening for cervical cancer among Roma women” (31; emphasis added). It is not mentioned in the 2000 WB report what the source is for the “indications” about the alleged Roma-related taboos; however, the allegations remain. In the WB publication, traditional Roma culture stands for a general attitude of avoiding the health care system, similar to the alleged aversion of the Roma to the educational system: “As is the case with education, some Roma see healthcare as a gadje institution and regard it with fear and mistrust” (31). It appears rather as a refusal of Roma to access medical care than a systemic exclusion from the health care system of those who do not match the requests (as, for example, employment) or do not have enough income to pay for medical check-ups. While in the “Housing” section the conclusion that Roma do not care about their houses and surroundings is based on “common impressions,” in the “Health” section the conclusion is grounded on “indications.” Thus, starting from weak premises (rumors, allegations, opinions, beliefs, and anecdotal evidence) the reports manage to convey strong conclusions in regard to how culture is responsible for the social and economic *status quo* of Roma.

In regard to places where Roma live, in the 2000 WB report these are exclusively referred to as “Roma settlements,” “Roma slums,” “Roma mahalas,” “Roma ghettos,” and “Roma neighbourhoods.” Yet, the acknowledgment of only these types of residence is not sustained by data. On the contrary, the report mentions that for example in Hungary, 13–14% of Roma are living in “settlement type of environments isolated from the majority population” (12), which means that most of the Roma inhabitants (more than 85% if it is to take the presented data at face value) live in relatively standard housing and not in isolated slums or ghettos. It is curious how the report gives preference to the small numbers, and ignores the big numbers referring to Roma living in common residential locations. Nonetheless, the only country for which residential figures of Roma are provided is Hungary, while residential information in other countries is not illustrated by data. This discourse about settlements, mahalas, and ghettos, as a rule for Roma and not as an exception, and the absence of data to substantiate it, points out the strategy of framing the group by describing Roma as inhabitants of ghettos. There is no doubt that urban ghettos exist, but

this type of living is neither exclusively confined to Roma, nor is it true that all Roma live in precarious conditions.

Repetitio est mater studiourum

Over time, the three frames—poverty as an overall Roma attribute, precarious living, and traditionalism—are maintained, strengthened, and reinforced through repetition and, more precisely, through recycling the statements used in previous reports. The fact that there are no self-citations of previous reports is of secondary importance for this analysis: what is of interest here is the use of repetition as a means of framing the Roma group. One can consult the 2000, 2002, and 2005 WB reports and observe that large parts of the text are identical or slightly changed, not in content but only in appearance. Therefore, repetition is the *modus operandi* for obtaining a Roma-related knowledge effect, which means that previous information is taken as accurate in consecutive reports. Some additional examples are provided below.

The section describing who Roma are relies on an almost intact transfer of a paragraph from the 2000 to the 2002, and further on to the 2005 report. This very general presentation of Roma as a group produces (perhaps involuntarily) a framing effect that closes other possible inquiries about who Roma are. The definition of Roma in the 2000 WB report is the following:

Roma are a unique minority in Europe. Unlike other groups, Roma have no historical homeland and are found in nearly all countries in Europe and Central Asia. The roots of the Roma in Europe are the subject of much debate. Historical records indicate that they migrated from northern India into Europe in waves between the ninth and fourteenth centuries. Roma constitute an extremely diverse minority: there are multiple subgroups based on linguistic, historical, and occupational distinctions. While Roma in some countries are nomadic, other groups have settled over time, some during the Ottoman Empire and others more recently under socialism. (2000, vii)

In the WB report from 2002, the same paragraph was slightly altered as follows:

Roma, or 'gypsies,' are a unique minority in Europe. Unlike other groups, Roma have no historical homeland and are found in nearly all countries in Europe and Central Asia. Current estimates suggest that between 7 and 9 million live throughout Europe, making them the largest minority in Europe. The roots of the Roma in Europe are the subject of much debate. Historical records indicate that they migrated from northern India into Europe in waves between the ninth and fourteenth centuries. While some Roma groups are nomadic, the vast majority of Roma in Central and Eastern Europe have settled over time, some during the Ottoman Empire and others more recently under socialism. (2002, 1)

And the paragraph is recycled once more in the WB report from 2005:

The Roma are Europe's largest and most vulnerable minority. They have no historical homeland but live in nearly all countries of Europe and Central Asia. The roots of the Roma are widely debated. Historical records indicate that they migrated in waves from northern India into Europe between the ninth and fourteenth centuries. Roma constitute an extremely diverse minority, with multiple subgroups based on linguistic, historical, and occupational distinctions. While some Roma groups are nomadic, the vast majority of Roma in Central and Eastern Europe have settled, some during the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires and others under socialism. (2005, 3)

As these reports are the most often cited papers by both academics and experts, ideas in these publications have been taken as the most relevant for studying Roma: poverty framed in ethnic terms, vulnerability and disadvantage, the Indian origin, nomadism and migration in Europe. However, reinforcement of these frames through repetition is not encountered solely in defining Roma, but also in topics regarding Roma-related policy intervention (advice and small projects rather than structural changes in education, health, housing, and labor systems). In this regard, the sections titled "Policy Implications" and "Policy Directions," as they are more directly referred to in the 2005 report, are composed of the same repeated themes and subjects in all

three WB reports. The following quote from the “Policy Implications” section is an example of a type of paragraph that echoes in all three WB reports. The initial appearance of the paragraph in the 2000 report is the following:

Addressing the issues facing the Roma is a challenging task that will take experimentation, patience, and close collaboration between Roma communities, the international community, NGOs, and national governments. Initiatives need to be designed and adapted to local circumstances, as well as the varying conditions and needs of different Roma groups. (39)

In 2002 WB study the paragraph appears as the following:

Addressing the issues facing the Roma is a challenging task that will take experimentation, time and patience. Initiatives need to be adapted to specific country and local circumstances taking into account the varying conditions and needs of different Roma communities. (32)

Finally the corresponding paragraph in the 2005 report reads as the following:

Addressing Roma issues will take experimentation, patience, and close collaboration between Roma communities, the international community, NGOs, and national governments. Initiatives need to be designed and adapted to local country circumstances, as well as to the varying needs of Roma groups. (192)

As could be observed from the quotes above, not only the introductory parts, setting the object of study (Roma), are highly repetitive, but also those parts that purport to be the conclusions of the WB reports. Leaving the policy papers unchanged in their policy sections leads one to believe that there is strong immobility in policy actions. It is also observable in the slight semantic changes (as for example from “Addressing the issues facing the Roma...” to “Addressing Roma issues...”) how the frame is transferred from the (systemic) problems encountered by Roma to the problems of Roma themselves.

In a few cases, highly stigmatizing descriptions of Roma are simply imported from the 2000 study into the 2005 report. The following paragraph is an example of a verbatim copy (without self-citation) from the 2000 WB report pasted into the 2005 WB report:

Women have resorted to employment in the sex industry as result of the dearth of employment opportunities elsewhere. Reported estimates for the Czech Republic suggested that out of the nearly 40,000 prostitutes in the country, some 25,000 are Roma women (ECOHST, 2000). Prostitution increases the risk of STDs, including HIV-AIDS for the Roma community at large. *However, to date there is no information on disease incidence.* (WB 2000, 22 and WB 2005, 53; emphasis added)

Beyond the contagious diseases (e.g., sexually transmitted diseases, hepatitis, TBC), for which the reports do not bring compelling evidence, merely stating that Roma communities are susceptible to “high incidence”/“high prevalence,” there is an insistence on immunization. Reports singularize Roma as a group disinclined to vaccination. Putting the blame on Roma refusing vaccination (even though this is documented only through case studies and the isolated opinions of medical staff) seems to be a decoupled tendency from the larger societal context of decreased trust in vaccination among the general population (in both Western and Eastern Europe). Even though the more general societal trend of reluctance toward compulsory vaccination was not so popular in 2000 or 2005, the isolation of Roma as the only group opposed to vaccination contributes to the deviant image of the group.

In the WB reports, the construction of the Roma profile as a vulnerable population relies on the repetition and recycling of the old papers into “new” studies. It seems relevant to recall here the conclusion of Willems (1997), who maintained that the literature about Roma for the period he studied (from the nineteenth century until the end of the Second World War) had been developing through a long series of repetitions of basic theses and assumptions not necessarily based on evidence. Beyond the multiplication of negative representations of the Roma group in the WB reports, the scholarly mindset is also framed in regard to Roma by the almost 400 citations of the three WB studies. Moreover, the citations of the WB reports produce further

citations, reducing Roma into an object of study and target for policy interventions based on the initial WB representations of Roma.

To sum up, the WB reports equate Roma with poverty, contagious diseases, voluntary evasion of healthcare and educational systems, as well as with socially isolated and removed cultural practices. Yet, the resulting image of Roma is an effect of aggregating scientific and expert practices, which also align with the more general societal expectations for typification. Therefore, even with the good intentions of organizations that seek to improve the situation of Roma, the perverse effect of composing and distributing a general, negative representation of the Roma group arises. The WB uses two intermingled frames for looking at Roma: poverty is the primary frame and ethnic boundary is the secondary frame. Beyond these frames, other representations are hardly discerned. The two overlapping frames produce a “picture” of the Roma group, which is setting up the scene for the narratives introduced by the WB’s most-cited publications.

*The selectivity of sources and assembling evidence
in Roma-related research*

In framing Roma, the WB reports are highly selective in the usage of references from social science studies. From the existing literature about Roma, the only references made in the WB papers are to those studies, which consider Roma ethnicity as unaltered throughout time with its immutable ethnic characteristics. The processes of assimilation, acculturation, mixed marriages, and social mobility are largely disregarded, and the general WB view on Roma preserves the specificity of the group: the recognizable ethnic markers of the group are unchanged since the fifteenth century. What is left out from this selection of Roma-related literature is the perspective of the Roma group as a result of ongoing marginalization, carried out by dominant groups in their attempt to present themselves positively by defining those regarded as different in a negative light. Although the WB papers mention that Roma origins are highly debated and controversial, they frame Roma as nomads, non-European, with a single Indian origin. In doing so, the WB reports omit the assessments of those social scientists and historians who describe Roma as a case of an autochthonous population (Okely 1983), or as a group suffering from a process of

minoritization due to authoritative stigmatization and labeling by state authorities and the academic community (Lucassen 1991; Willems 1997; Lucassen, Willems, and Cottaar 1998). These viewpoints are neglected despite the fact that the authors above are well-positioned in the field of studies about Roma.²

Beyond the selectivity of sources, the second level of trade-offs in the WB studies is related to data selection, construction, and presentation. While WB studies admit that data brought as evidence for describing Roma are fragile and unreliable, their findings are nevertheless presented as valid. In other words, sound conclusions are elicited from fragile premises. The following quote from the 2005 WB study reflects the concern about data fragility, but reiterates with confidence the robustness of the WB analysis: "While the gaps and limitations of the information base on Roma are real, this does not invalidate the entire body of analysis" (25). Unfortunately, it is not specified how much of the WB analysis is invalidated by such data brought as evidence.

The 2000 and 2005 WB studies in several places (sometimes with the same words) refer to their own previously produced evidence. When not referring to their own evidence, the authors of WB reports are using data sources qualified by them as "anecdotal." To bring unreliable ("anecdotal") information about Roma does not prevent them from drawing sound conclusions with a high potential to transmit a generally negative image of Roma. Moreover, this "anecdotal" evidence is used as research justification both in the 2000 and in the 2005 reports for conducting research on "Roma issues." The sentences below provide some examples: "Other than anecdotal evidence, there is very little information on the prevalence of STDs and drug abuse among Roma communities" (WB 2000, 22); "There is growing anecdotal evidence that discrimination serves as a barrier to labor force participation for Roma" (WB 2000, 16); "Information on Roma living conditions and poverty is scarce, fragmented, and often anecdotal" (WB 2005, 11).

² Beyond the new conceptualization of Roma brought in *Romani Studies*, these authors also score highly on the number of citations and are widely read in this field.

While in the 2000 report rumors and anecdotes might serve as a basis for advancing a research rationale, bringing the same reason five years later, namely that of “filling the gap” related to Roma, could be seen as a perpetual argument for doing research on Roma for the sake of “filling the gap.”³ This approach to the Roma population suggests that the Roma group is seen as a fixed, immobile, non-dynamic entity, awaiting the measurements of experts, rather than evolving and changing in the dialectic relationship between individuals and society, as well as due to group relationships. Roma ethnicity seems to be understood as objectively embodied in the person.

Another trade-off in Roma-related data construction in the WB studies is the size of the Roma group. Since censuses are assumed to underestimate the Roma population size, credibility and objectivity are given to other estimates. The size of the Roma group in the WB research is simply provided by political actors (i.e., CoE 1994) as rough numbers. The following statement from the 2000 WB report about the size of Roma displays some initial circumspection as to whether this number is in fact realistic: “From 7 to 9 million Roma *are thought* to live throughout the countries of Europe...” (7; emphasis added). Despite this caution regarding Roma population size, the 2005 report advances the same estimate of Roma: “Size *estimates* of Europe’s Roma population range from 7 million to 9 million, similar to the total population of many smaller European states” (3; emphasis added). Soft words as “thought” and “estimate” that denote subjectivity are used to introduce and advance hard numbers. The WB, as an expert organization, relies on estimates instead of being skeptical of numbers other than the official census data (whatever the methodological limits of ethnicity measurement in censuses are), and the WB acknowledges that external actors (experts) know better than Roma themselves who Roma are. Through expert estimates, the object of study is created and a fixed numerical frame is formed, and in turn further reinforced in consecutive reports. The analytical definition of Roma from the 2005 WB report is adapted so as to fit the (political) size of the Roma population: “For the purpose of analysis in this book,

³ Even today, Roma-related research and project proposals use the argument of “filling the gap” for conducting research.

Roma are defined broadly to include both those who identify themselves as Roma and those identified by others as Roma. This stems both from the data sources used and from the policy focus of this analysis. After all, if policies affect ethnic minorities, they will do so regardless of how people identify themselves” (26). However, throughout the report Roma is described as natural and not constructed group for the purpose of the research. It is omitted that the Roma category was initially coined as a circumstantial policy definition, and the Roma group constructed through policy is treated as a self-conscious community sharing common ethnic markers.

The proposal of a generous estimate of the Roma population is therefore used as a reason for constructing the object of study. The WB reports depart from the assumption that Roma are unwilling to declare themselves as Roma, and propose to define Roma in a broader sense so as to include those who do not self-identify as Roma. With the acceptance of the 7–9 million estimate (an overestimate, not an underestimate), it appears as if the WB’s policies will (positively) also affect those Roma who do not want to declare themselves as Roma. This way, the number of 7–9 million members of an ethnic minority (although not all of those included in this analytical definition are willing to be defined as such) is put forward with the aim of developing policies. By 2011, the size of the Roma population has been raised by policymakers to 10–12 million. This new number is not presented anymore as an estimate, and it seems that the number does not need any source of reference as it is displayed as a reality taken for granted. For example, the estimate appears in the UNDP, WB, and EC regional Roma surveys, describing Roma as “Europe’s largest minority of 10–12 million people” (FRA and UNDP 2012, 3). Moreover, the size of the Roma population is a number that has spread beyond the boundaries of politics and become common knowledge. Mass media significantly contributed to this knowledge transfer from experts to the general public.

The World Bank presents itself as a neutral institution that examines the phenomenon of poverty affecting countries in Central and Eastern Europe (among others), although its social policy advices⁴ largely con-

⁴ On the World Bank’s influence, amongst other international organizations that shape the welfare policies of Eastern European states, see, for example, Deacon and Hulse (1997), and Deacon (2000).

tributed to the financial reduction of social budgets (by replacing comprehensive welfare entitlements with means-tested social assistance) in the 1990s. These cuts in social spending in turn highly contributed to the pauperization of a large number of people, including Roma. The impression left by WB studies creates a new understanding of poverty in CEE as a phenomenon that only applies to Roma (the main losers of the transition). The ethnicization of (Roma) poverty in the WB studies about Roma comes to replace and subvert a discourse on citizenship (national or European) by stripping Roma of their citizenship attributes and by framing Roma poverty alongside their supposed ethnic characteristics, rather than due to systemic reasons. While poverty among Roma is a fact, nevertheless, poverty is not an ethnic attribute and ethnicity should not be used in order to justify the discussion of societal and systemic economic problems. The minor ethnically-targeted projects, also advocated by the WB, proved that the ethnicization of poverty could not provide an answer to structural, societal, and economic problems; moreover, such projects only weakened the premises of social solidarity.

2. ROMA WELFARE DEPENDENCY: HOW REPRESENTATIONS ARE CREATED AND DISMANTLED (CASE STUDY 2)

Roma as a specific target group for the Millennium Development Goals (MDG)⁵ has come at a time when it was obvious that poverty was not decreasing but, on the contrary, was on the rise. Development agencies approached Roma as a new target group for giving the old anti-poverty measures a more specific object of intervention.⁶ The entrance of Roma

⁵ Millennium Development Goals (MDG) refer to eight goals set for international development agencies by the United Nations in 2000. The goals aim to achieve a global reduction in poverty.

⁶ Although the “Millennium Development Goals” (2004) UNDP paper is not a report about Roma but about MDG in four countries in Central Europe, Roma appear as the main topic in all sections of the report: “Poverty, generalised deprivation and social exclusion are most visible in one particular minority in these four countries: the Roma” (14). One year later, the report “Faces of Poverty” (2005) by the UNDP explicitly linked Roma and MDG (5–6).

on the research and policy scene as a new group—the object of anti-poverty—gave the development agencies a new organizational impetus and strengthened their legitimacy as experts on combating poverty. In this context of creating new target groups for anti-poverty measures, the portrayal of Roma as a welfare-dependent group comes as a piece in a wider process of the ethnicization of poverty-related social problems (such as low levels of education, illiteracy, unemployment, and under-development). While the ethnicization of social problems might be a rational process that follows an institutional logic of problem solving in development agencies, for the Roma group its labeling as a target for international organizations is of little to no benefit.

The picture of Roma as welfare recipients was fully shaped for the first time in a highly influential study of the UNDP from 2002.⁷ The accent of the report is on labeling Roma as governmental welfare dependent recipients, which is evident even from the title of the study (“Avoiding the Dependency Trap”). The study is characterized by radicalization of the academic and policy discourse about Roma by introducing themes not encountered before, such as “dependency culture” and “Roma crime,” and by the intensification of labeling (the word “crime” appears no less than 27 times). The study collects data from 5034 persons from five countries (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia). In the executive summary, the report assumes representativeness for all five countries covered, as well as for the whole CEE region. Yet, in Annex 1 of the report, which details the methodology, the authors revise their own initial claim on representativeness: “It is of course impossible to claim complete statistical representativeness, as the sampling was hampered by ambiguities concerning who actually is a Roma, and the size of the Roma population in each country” (87). A reasonable question to ask is what kind of representativeness the reader is persuaded by at the beginning of the study, if statistical representativeness is not claimed. Just a few paragraphs later, after the excuse for the lack of “complete statistical representativeness,” the authors admit that their study samples mainly consist of poor Roma groups: “Even a perfectly designed sample will probably over-represent the worst-off segments of the Roma population, since these are recog-

⁷ For a previous critique of this report, see Acton (2006).

nizably Roma and are most unlikely to be integrated into majority communities" (87). Moreover, it is obvious that the study claims representativeness and generalizes for the whole CEE region (naming the paper a "regional report" and referring to "Roma population throughout the region," using the word "region" over 100 times) while the research was carried out merely in five countries. Regardless of how small the Roma populations are in the other CEE countries not included in the study, the report nevertheless cannot assume regional representativeness without covering all countries in the region. The self-doubts of the authors in regard to the representativeness of the sample are in stark contrast with the categorical statements throughout the entire report describing Roma as a regional welfare-dependent group.

Since the report makes the idea of Roma dependency on social welfare a leitmotif and also oversamples the poor, the question remains: does the study have any "findings," beyond repeating that the Roma are dependent on the generosity of the state? Hence, to stress this point, it is evident that in a sample dominated by the poor (as even the authors acknowledge), it will be more people who are dependent on state benefits than in a sample which proportionally covers all social categories. Roma dependency on welfare in the UNDP 2002 report is attributed to a set of causes, including discrimination, although the dominant perspective is blaming the victim. Consequently, the economic status of Roma is explained at least partly by the "disinterest" of Roma people in their own welfare: "Poverty, dependency on social welfare, and a *disinterest in adopting proactive life strategies* are both historical legacies of the past and the root causes of the social exclusion and discrimination that Roma experience today" (UNDP 2002, 79; emphasis added). The supposed apathy of Roma to break out from poverty in which they live today, which is due to their life strategies, resembles closely the laziness attributed to Roma in mass media. Whatever the "proactive life strategies" may mean in this context, in addition to the "disinterest" explanation, the main idea of the report is that poor Roma people are to be seen as responsible for their poverty due to their complacency. The report presents dependence as an unfortunate rational choice of the people, as far as governments in the surveyed countries provide the incentives for subsisting on social welfare.

The report makes a step further and labels Roma as a group "trapped" in a culture of dependency, to borrow the word from the

title, also appearing very often in the report. The word “culture” is used often in combination with the word “dependency” to designate dependency as a specific characteristic of Roma. From the approximately thirty mentions of the word “culture” in reference to Roma, in fourteen cases it occurs in combination, as “dependency culture.” When not used together with the term “dependency,” the word “culture” appears more often in the syntagm of “ghetto culture,” and from the five mentions as part of this syntagm, only the first time is it written in quotation marks. Thus, “ghetto culture” is acknowledged in the report as a specific cultural trait of Roma. The theme of “culture dependency” is not at all value-free, as one would expect from an expert report, but seems to be part of neoliberal ideology: in several places in the report the authors warn about the “danger” of transferring financial means to Roma because of the unsustainability of such interventions. The report advocates that programs targeting Roma should not provide direct benefits, in order to avoid recipients becoming dependent on these benefits: “It will also increase sensitivity to the danger that, even with the best of intentions, programs that are not sustainable can in fact deepen the already problematic dependency cultures found in many Roma communities” (UNDP 2002, 8).

In their fight with the “culture of dependency,” the authors assume that cuts in governmental welfare assistance for the poor, and especially for Roma, although they will produce suffering for the families in need, are nevertheless desirable in order to combat dependency. The argument is made even more cynical by affirming that the cuts in governmental assistance will affect mainly children (especially in Romania and Bulgaria). The main rationale for advising cuts in social welfare, which are seen as social policy reform is that families and children would not be hurt by changing welfare regimes because the existing level of financial assistance already leaves the children undernourished, so a reduced level of assistance would not bring additional suffering (UNDP 2002, 82).

In contrast to what the UNDP 2002 report asserts, there are academic empirical analyses that contradict the theory of supposed Roma dependence on social welfare. These analyses demonstrate that Roma are not dependent on social welfare, but, on the contrary, many of them fail to access the system of social benefits to which they are entitled as any other citizen: “[...] in Romania, for the period 1995–2000,

state social transfers benefited non-Roma households more than Roma households” (Rat 2005, 112).

The UNDP study, consequently, contributed to disseminating the image of Roma as a group dependent on governmental welfare due to the wide circulation of the report and its frequent citation in mass media. In a document⁸ presenting the 2002 UNDP study entitled “Avoiding the Dependency Trap,” the UNDP report is appreciated as a “publication with longest ‘shelf-life,’” which won the award for “Excellence in Policy Impact,” competing with 67 other nominated studies from 40 different countries. Moreover, the same document noted that the report was a “record-breaking” study with “over 200 mentions in the international and national media in the first month after the launch, with new coverage added regularly still.” Beyond the professional promotion of the UNDP report through press releases, its high coverage in mass media could be due to the fact that the image of Roma constructed by the report is a perfect match for Roma-related stereotypes that already circulate in the media. Under these conditions, an expert study carried out by a prestigious international institution sustains a public political discourse that stigmatizes Roma (on allegations of abusing the social welfare system). Three years later, UNDP reasserted the thesis of Roma welfare dependency: “Roma are particularly vulnerable to dependency traps. With limited development opportunities and few successful role models from their own communities, Roma can easily reduce their professional aspirations to the point where *survival on social welfare is an acceptable option*” (2006a, 103; emphasis added).

To follow the narrative of Roma welfare dependency, a study conducted around the same time by the World Bank (2005) raised the issue of such popular representation but omitted any reference to policy studies previously elaborated by the UNDP as significant contributors in creating and reproducing the image of Roma as a welfare-dependent group (although the 2002 UNDP study appears among the list of references). Instead, the WB report asserts that the representation of Roma as a welfare-dependent group emerged merely as a con-

⁸ “Diversity Management and the UNDP: Revisiting the ‘Dependency Trap’”—an undated Word document uploaded on the www.europeandcis.undp.org.

sequence of non-Roma people's opinion. Moreover, the welfare dependency of Roma is seen as purely a matter of outsiders' perception, and not an echo of previous policy studies and mass media articles and news (often quoting policy studies). In addition, the report notes that the perception of Roma as welfare-dependent contributes to Roma-related negative stereotypes: "For many outsiders, the dependency of Roma on benefits reinforced stereotypes of Roma as social parasites who would rather receive income support than work" (2005, 85).

The WB continued the series of studies about Roma and about their supposed over-reliance on state welfare provisions with the 2008 study:⁹ "Roma receive social benefits more frequently than non-Roma in excluded communities ... Social benefits are received by 65 percent of Roma and 'only' by 50 percent of non-Roma" (61). It is important to note the continuity of the theme of Roma dependence on welfare benefits in the WB studies because the very topic of welfare dependence is dismantled afterwards by the same organization as being a "myth" created by "public perception," without acknowledging that the WB itself (and other development agencies) played a role in the creation and circulation of this myth due to their influence in the policy and academic community, as well as in mass media. Thus, in 2010 the WB embarked on a research demonstrating the weaknesses of arguments that sustain the theory of Roma dependency on governmental assistance.¹⁰ The 2010 WB policy note aims (in subsidiary) to deconstruct the stereotypical image of Roma as a welfare-dependent group, but it fails to mention that this image was at least partially created through policy research itself.

Unmaking public opinion

It is timely to recall the standpoint of Bourdieu (1972), maintaining that public opinion does not exist until it is created by the sponsors of opinion polls. Moreover, in assembling public opinion, the political,

⁹ For a critical analysis of this study, see also van Baar (2009).

¹⁰ The WB (2010) theme of deconstructing the myth of Roma as a welfare-dependent group is reasserted in the WB (2011) report. It is worth observing that the texts that aim at deconstruction are shorter and less disseminated than those, which initially formulated the welfare dependency topic.

managerial, and expert roles influence the research design. They drive all research stages: selection of the discussion themes, framing and ranking questions, selection of the respondents, construction of the categories of analysis, and aggregation of the answers. In what follows, by a close reading of the “stakeholders survey” in the 2010 WB policy note, I describe an example in relation to the issue of Roma welfare dependency, which is presented in this policy note as a matter of public opinion. I do not assert that the public at large does not hold negative perceptions about Roma as privileged beneficiaries of social assistance programs, but I claim that this public perception emerged in conjunction with publicly expressed views of powerful opinion framers, such as politicians, mass media, and development agencies that sketched the way of viewing Roma in such a manner.

While the 2010 WB policy note suggests that public opinion of Roma as a welfare dependent group is biased, and even if this appraisal proved valid, what the WB paper considers “public perception” is, as I show below, roughly manufactured. Namely, “public perception” in the WB policy note is based on the answers to a questionnaire answered by “222 stakeholders—government and non-government officials and Roma and non-Roma” (WB 2010, 4). Further in the report, one may gain some more clarity in regard to the composition of the sample, and it seems that the heterogeneity of the respondents is much wider than initially announced: “About one-third of stakeholders interviewed were central and local government officials, and the remainder representatives of civil society, education, and media. Approximately 4 out of 10 self-identified as being Roma” (6). Digging deeper, Appendix 1 describes the sample per categories, and one can observe that the “stakeholders” are a much more eclectic population (with an uneven distribution) containing, besides the governmental and non-governmental representatives, also “teachers,” “school officials,” “international organization,” and, peculiarly, “parents” (28). The selection criteria for the sample are not given; moreover, there is no explanation why these persons are considered stakeholders. What is presented as “public perception” are the representations held by the above 222 selected subjects. Although among the respondents “approximately 4 out of 10 self-identified as being Roma” (6), the results are not analyzed by ethnicity (which otherwise was, apparently, considered relevant in structuring opinion as far as the respondents were asked to disclose their ethnicity) to see whether

there are differences between the two categories, Roma and non-Roma. Even though the study claims a qualitative component, gained through 100 in depth interviews with “nearly half” of the stakeholders, with the exception of a single quote (on page 13), any interpretation of these in-depth interviews is lacking. The “public perception” was thus based merely on frequency analyses of the online questionnaire that included 222 “stakeholders,” covering the 4 countries surveyed.

Beyond the well-known fact that answers to online questionnaires are less reliable than data gathered face-to-face, the study builds “public perception” on the answers drawn from a small number of haphazardly selected cases. There are no criteria for internal consistency of the sample categories (for example, number of men and women, age groups, residence in urban vs. rural areas, and so forth). Moreover, besides the numerous categories of respondents—nine, to be precise, including central government officials, local/regional government officials, NGO community, press/media, international organizations, school officials, teachers, parents, other—that lead to difficulties in finding trends for each category (and therefore reliable outcomes), none of the considered categories of stakeholders is consistent across countries. For example, for the category of “school officials,” eleven persons in Romania, one in Serbia, and none in Bulgaria and the Czech Republic were selected. If analyzing the sample by countries, the Czech Republic, for example, has zero “press/media” respondents, no respondents from “international organizations,” zero “school officials,” and zero respondents in the “teachers” category; the report misleads the reader in referring to “public opinion,” which in the case of the Czech Republic is based on many empty categories. In the category of “parents,” there are nine cases for all of the four countries (one in Bulgaria, three in the Czech Republic, three in Romania, and two in Serbia). “Parents” is a very wide category, which is vague in the absence of characteristics, such as age, number and age of children, professional background, and other socio-economic variables. Besides, it is unclear who those nine parents are who answered the online WB questionnaire and how they were recruited for the research. From millions of parents in these four countries, how were only nine cases selected, and how can their opinions stand for parents’ “public perception” on Roma?

The way in which questions of the survey are conceived is also debatable. It is exceedingly difficult to elicit whose perception the

“public perception” refers to throughout the study. The 222 persons from four countries (45 from Bulgaria, 35 from the Czech Republic, 99 from Romania, and 43 from Serbia) were asked to answer what the thoughts are of “an average person” from the majority population regarding reasons for low Roma employment. As the report describes,

The stakeholders that were interviewed were asked to share their views on what they believed the average person from the majority sees as the reasons for low Roma employment. The question provided five possible, non-mutually exclusive reasons. The reasons given were: (1) unlucky—not enough jobs; (2) lazy and lack of willpower; (3) face discrimination; (4) lack sufficient education or qualification; (5) prefer to live off social assistance. (WB 2010, 12, footnote 4)

In other words, what stands for “public perception” in the WB policy note is an indirect, alleged societal representation on a specific issue, or a representation of a supposed representation of an average public, or, even more concisely, a representation of a representation. Moreover, taking into account that answers are pre-coded, one may legitimately think that the results are in fact a representation of the researcher about the respondents’ representation of the representation of an *average* population about the low employment of Roma.

What should a scholar interested in Roma and welfare dependency take as valid information: the Roma dependency myth constructed by the 2002 UNDP study or the welfare dependency deconstruction of the WB study years later? A close reading of these policy reports shows how the Roma welfare dependency myth was created by development agencies (and mirrored societal perceptions circulated by mass media), and it was dismantled at a later point when changes in the welfare systems in CEE were so abrupt (i.e., social spending cuts presented as reforms) that Roma were not the only ones affected any more, but so were large segments of the population. The myth of Roma welfare dependency could not be sustained anymore, as long as most of the social entitlements were cut off for all citizens. However, the initial advancement of this myth by international development agencies contributed to changes in policy regimes in CEE after 1990, leaving behind the principle of universalist social policies.

3. GENETIC STUDIES: INTEREST IN ROMA ORIGIN(S) AND MOBILITY (CASE STUDY 3)

Genetics as a branch of the natural sciences has a higher reputation for objectivity by comparison with the humanities and social sciences: classifications, definitions, and descriptions proposed by genetics are more authoritative for the general public, as well as for scientists. The overall higher credibility of genetics papers compared with academic discourse is likely due to the flourishing of research in this field in the 1990s in connection with the development of the Human Genome Project (HGP), which aimed at the complete mapping of human DNA. Geneticists demonstrated already in the 1970s that variation in genetic characteristics is higher within a group (intra-group variation) than among groups (inter-group variation), hence proving that the concept of race is a fallacy of no use for the classification of human beings and inadequate to account for human diversity (Lewontin 1972). Since then, numerous other genetic studies culminating in the HGP project produced similar findings, but despite these findings, geneticists never ceased to study human diversity, if not in terms of races but of ethnicity. Due to the contribution of geneticists, the categorical dichotomy Roma–non-Roma was employed in genetic studies after 1990, continuing a tradition of Roma-related genetic research for almost a century.¹¹

I have chosen to analyze in depth the representation of the Roma in genetic papers from the sample because I found Genetics to be the most efficient field¹² in the construction of Roma-related discourse. From the eighteen genetic papers in the sample, only one paper was published in the first decade (1999) of the reference period 1990–2013. The remaining seventeen papers were published from 2000 to

¹¹ In 1921, following a research tradition called sero-anthropology, the first blood group study (by Verzár and Weszeczky) was published, in which by using the measure called “biochemical race index,” Roma were contrasted as a different racial group in comparison with Hungarians and Germans.

¹² The bibliometric analysis of my sample shows that in terms of average citations per paper, there are 34.44 citations per paper in the genetics category, compared with 21.33 citations in the social sciences.

2013, with a peak of publications (eleven papers) in the period 2001–2005. It appears that there was an increase in genetic research on Roma quite recently, which coincided with growing attention toward Roma as an object of study in other fields of inquiry, such as the social sciences and humanities. Yet not only science became more interested in Roma, but also in the same period politics and administrative practices started to greatly emphasize their interest in Roma, as well as mass media. While fields such as the Social Sciences, Romani Studies, and Legal/Human Rights were more active in building up the corpus of studies about Roma during the 1990s (74 of the 251 papers from the sample published between 1990 and 2000), genetics has restored its interest in Roma after the year 2000 once Roma were reconstituted as an established scientific topic and political subject.

For sorting out the eighteen genetic papers, I was initially guided by the titles of the journals in which these articles appeared. Some of these journals have obvious medical affiliations, while others host a broader range of genetic literature, including papers on population genetics. According to their focus, the eighteen papers from my sample could be assigned to two categories: medical genetics, which is tied to medical aspects, and population genetics, which is more concerned with genetic variation in the current population. While medical genetics seeks to identify genetic mutations that are responsible for a series of diseases and conditions of the Roma population, their focus remains theoretical and these studies do not suggest practical advances for the described diseases. The category of population genetics when applied to humans (and not to animals or plants) describes human genetic variation according to theoretical and statistical models of human population segmentation. Background knowledge supporting theoretical models of populations in genetics is sometimes brought from the social sciences. The decision to classify genetic papers in two categories (medical and population genetics) was not an easy one: while some of the population genetic papers considered healthy individuals in order to describe human variation, other papers selected individuals with specific diseases for acknowledging human diversity. The selection of individuals with specific diseases happens due to the fact that population genetics research strives to make its own research useful for medical genetics, as is the case with applications of population genetics research in pharmacogenomics and personalized

medicine (or the so-called race-based medicine¹³). Therefore, in the category of population genetics I also placed those papers that select individuals with specific diseases and speak about human variation at a biological level.

Following this classification of medical and population genetics, about half of the papers (ten out of eighteen) from the sample fell in the category of population genetics. These papers seem to have three main themes of concern: (1) describing human variation by conceiving Roma as an ethnic category in opposition to other ethnic categories, or to a conglomerate entity such as non-Roma; (2) asserting Roma origin(s); and (3) asserting and reconstructing the Roma's geographic past mobility from the Indian subcontinent.

Some of the article titles from the category of population genetics are very suggestive in describing the main themes of genetics in relation to Roma. Namely the titles pertain to origin, history, and migration: "Mutation history of the Roma/Gypsies" (Morar et al. 2004); "Mitochondrial DNA variability in Slovaks, with application to the Roma origin" (Malyarchuk et al. 2008); "Reconstructing the Indian origin and dispersal of the European Roma: A maternal genetic perspective" (Mendizabal et al. 2011); or "Reconstructing the population history of European Romani from Genome-wide data" (Mendizabal et al. 2012).

Beyond the titles, what are the main narratives of the genetic papers? One of the papers (Kalaydjieva, Gresham, and Calafell 2001) in my sample that obtained a high score of 78 citations summarizes the findings of forty years of genetic research about Roma and aims to provide a meta-analysis of postwar genetic papers about Roma. In this article, 124 genetic research studies¹⁴ about Gypsies/Roma from 1960 to 2000 were identified and subsequently assessed. These 124 genetic studies represent 41.8% out of all the articles referring to Gypsies from the searched medical databases; therefore, a high interest in genetic research about Roma prevails when com-

¹³ See Epstein (2007) for the controversial role of affirmative action policy of inclusion based on racial and ethnic categories in the US for shaping race-based medicine.

¹⁴ Studies were found in the PubMed/MEDLINE databases of the USA National Library of Medicine by queries using the keyword "Gypsies."

pared to “social problems related to the health of the Roma (28.6%), or general medical problems (29.6%)” (Kalaydjieva, Gresham, and Calafell 2001, 3). The authors’ conclusion, drawn from the content analysis of the genetic papers about Gypsies published after the Second World War, is that the main research interest of these studies is highlighting the Indian origin of Roma, even in research studies where the declared aim was not that of recomposing a history of Roma, but that of answering Roma-related health needs. The meta-analysis above draws attention to the lack of usefulness of genetic research in arriving at health improvements for the studied Roma population:

Post-war genetic research has been preoccupied with the Indian origins of the Roma, pursuing the “Indian connection” even in studies meant to focus on severe genetic disorders. Most studies have remained in the realm of scientific exploration, away from the health needs of the Roma. Many publications display judgmental and paternalistic attitudes, that would be considered unacceptable if used with regard to other populations. (Kalaydjieva, Gresham, and Calafell 2001, 3)

The fact that most of the genetic papers focus on the “Indian connection” of Roma may suggest that genetic research is not oriented towards answering Roma health needs, but rather ventures to arbitrate among theories of Roma origin and to make itself relevant, if not useful, to current expert and political debates around “Roma issues.” Moreover, geneticists seem to be unaffected by the findings of anthropologists (e.g., Okely 1983; Stewart 1997) who, after studying Roma groups for a long time by participant observation methods, found that issues connected to Roma origin and their history of migrations do not arouse interest and are not discussed by Roma themselves, but merely by experts. It should also be observed that the articles about Roma, especially in population genetics, are usually published by rather large multinational teams of researchers (there are sometimes articles authored by more than twenty scholars). These large disciplinary teams imply considerable logistical and financial resources that are allocated not only for laboratory research, but also for theoretical endeavors; geneticists themselves acknowledge that the outcomes of

genetic studies on Roma remain highly theoretical and their practicalities for everyday life are difficult to follow.

In the analysis below, I am interested first in the role that genetic papers play in arbitration or mediation of controversies developed in other scientific or expert fields, such as the Social Sciences, Romani Studies, or Public Policy. Rather than simply insisting on the “Indian connection” as an issue, I place more emphasis on how this connection is brought up as an argument for settling disputes about Roma origin from other scientific fields. Second, I am interested in the representations of Roma in genetic papers as a result of sampling strategies (samples supposed to be representative of Roma as a group, whose size is estimated by geneticists at 8–10 million in Europe). Geneticists work with an estimate of the Roma population’s size (which, as I have previously shown, is a highly debatable and political topic) and with estimates of the Roma’s time of departure¹⁵ from India (which is again a disputed date), but still they seem to be immune to doubts and proclaim their findings with reassurance. While some genetic studies rely on linguistic theories and on a very few historical sources when assigning a point of departure of Roma from India, other genetic papers assume it as a by-product discovered by genetic research.

Endogamy as a master narrative frame in Roma-related genetic papers

The concept of endogamy was originally developed in the social sciences (mainly in anthropology and ethnology) and transferred afterwards into the life sciences. However, in pursuing genetic research, the concept of endogamy (and, as a result, that of endogamous groups) was not an encompassing framework applied solely to Roma. Other groups, such as Jews, Basques, Sami, and Finns, were equally framed by geneticists as endogamous. In the development of human genetics after the Second World War, geneticists were rather eager to normalize the concept by stripping it of the negative connotations of incestuous relationships and maintaining its meaning as related to

¹⁵ The point of departure of Roma from India varies in genetic studies from 900–1100 to 1500 years ago; see, for example, Mendizabal et al. (2012) and Gresham et al. (2001).

marriages only among members of a group but not with outsiders (see Lipphardt 2014).

In the genetic papers from my sample, Roma endogamy appears as a theme in the very beginning of the genetic narrative construction, so that what follows can rely and confirm the endogamy assumptions imported from the social sciences. The number of sources sustaining Roma endogamy is very limited in genetic research, and consists mainly of ethnographic research data endorsed by participant observation technique. Roma categorization as an endogamous population is the result of outdated field research in relatively small and traditional communities. In most of the cases, for the selection of ethnographic sources geneticists neglect historical or social research that contradicts the endogamy frame they have advanced.

Endogamy in relation to Roma is seen as a rule that prescribes marriages predominantly inside their own group and prohibits marriages with people that are external to the group. Moreover, endogamy appears somehow even stricter as the rule is applied not only in relation to non-Roma but also to diverse Roma sub-groups.

But what is the reason for calling on social science sources (referring to endogamy and origin) to constitute genetic research premises? The answer is related partially to the development of genetics as a science after the postwar period, when the old and discredited concept of *race* was replaced by that of *population*. While in the interwar period serological research referred to race, in the genetic studies after the 1960s, following the discovery of DNA and the development of molecular biology, the new reference was to population. However, historians of science (e.g., Gannett 2001; Gannett and Grieseimer 2004; Lipphardt and Niewöhner 2007; Lipphardt 2012) argue that, in fact, usage of the concept of race was not discontinued in genetic research, rather it was only the name of the term that changed to that of population, while the approach that sees human groups as distinct categories and not part of the same continuum persisted. Genetic research developed from serological research (study of blood groups) to the molecular paradigm (DNA); in this move, in order to distance itself from the old serological paradigm and stay abreast of the new one, ideally, genetic researchers should have demonstrated that a “population” is an isolate, and not just to postulate it. As Lipphardt (2014) argues, the concept of “genetic isolate” was closely related to

notion of endogamy or to that of geographical separateness, providing the main reasons for considering a collectivity as a biologically distinct population. Or, in order to choose a genetic isolate as an object of study, such a “population” must be postulated *a priori* as an isolate (with arguments of endogamy and/or geographical separateness), and then it must be reconfirmed *a posteriori* through genetic research as a biologically unitary and consistent entity. As Gannett and Griesemer (2004) demonstrate, this transformation from a subjective *a priori* classification into an objective *a posteriori* population requires the employment of a vast methodological apparatus that is meant to transform, through laboratory inscriptions, the arbitrary assignment of individuals in a genetic sample (by their anthropological or ethnological categorization) into an objective entity. In this operation of transformation, the selection of the subjects in the genetic samples is made through the usage of “social-political and biological-anthropological categories of classification” (Gannett and Griesemer 2004, 139). It comes thus that political or expert knowledge permeates scientific knowledge or at least contributes to its construction.

Coming back to the issue of constituting Roma as a subject of genetic research, genetic samples of Roma were made possible by borrowing from social science classifications those descriptions of Roma that presented the group as an endogamous and/or geographically separated population (equated with a genetic isolate). In this light, it is understandable why genetic research makes reference to social science sources for defining Roma as an endogamous population, although reliance on external sources seems redundant since genetic studies claim to demonstrate the very existence of endogamy. After all, why would objective genetic research not depart from random and uncategorized genetic samples to arrive at findings about endogamy, but instead use the pre-categorizations and sources from social sciences?

In their highly cited article¹⁶ Gresham et al. (2001) note, for example, that endogamy among Roma sub-groups should be a legacy of the exclusivist occupational branches (caste-like) that Roma brought

¹⁶ The article “Origins and divergence of the Roma (Gypsies)” has 124 citations, being the most referenced paper in the Genetics category of the sample.

intact from India and maintained unchanged for more than 1000 years within the European context. The assertion of endogamy based on occupational structure runs on the argument that if “professional ethnonyms” assigned to Roma sub-groups by anthropologists and ethnologists continue to be in use today, then the exclusionary rules of marriage among occupational groups should also be in place. Instead, what is left out is that the current occupational patterns of Roma have significantly changed over time, even though the denominations of occupational groups (occupational labels) persisted to a certain extent. Nowadays, to a large extent, occupational labels do not signify crafts that people are practicing. Moreover, together with the changes that occurred in the occupational patterns of Roma (and of society in general), the perception of who the insiders and outsiders of the group are should also have drastically changed. Due to social and economic changes (including that of the labor market), groups that remain tied to their traditional crafts are a very small segment of Roma today. Therefore, patterns of endogamy associated with occupational labels of Roma sub-groups could not have survived over time because many of the occupational groups diminished in size, or were dismembered. Additionally, in all likelihood it is false to assume that in the past there were occupations practiced exclusively by Roma and that only Roma used the family as a work unit, when, in fact, this was commonplace (Lucassen 1991). Social historians reached the conclusion that the Gypsy ethnicity, at least in Western Europe, is a typical case of the minoritization of certain itinerant and occupational groups (Lucassen 1991; Willems 1997; Lucassen, Willems, and Cottaar 1998). In this light, occupational groups could not be deemed as a reliable proxy, neither for ethnicity, nor for endogamy.

According to the above accounts, there is nothing in terms of occupational status or spatial mobility that is specific to Gypsies and only to them. Even when views that Roma ethnicity is socially constructed are mentioned in genetic research, these references are treated expediently in comparison with sources sustaining Roma as an essential identity enforced by rules of endogamy. What genetics seeks to confirm are the essential markers of the Roma category: Roma are seen even today as a population of endogamous groups delimited by occupational castes. The exotic and pejorative manner of framing Roma in some of the genetic research (like in policy research) can be observed

through the usage of specific stylistic devices: some of the genetic studies refer to Roma collectivities with labels such as “bands,” “clans,” and “tribes.”

Other genetic studies also endorse the concept of endogamy in relation to Roma. Thus, the study of Morar et al. (2004), similarly to that of Gresham et al. (2001), relies mainly on the same sources¹⁷ from the social sciences to prove Roma endogamy. The support for the Roma endogamy thesis appears in Gresham et al. (2001, 1327) as the following: “The argument of diverse origins rooted in India is supported by the social organization of the Roma, whose multiple endogamous populations with professional ethnonyms bear close resemblance to the jatis of India (Fraser 1992; Marushiakova and Popov 1997).” The same argument of endogamy as a rule among Roma sub-groups is presented below in the research of Morar et al. (2004, 597): “The social organization of the Gypsies, similar to the endogamous professional jatis of India, includes numerous Gypsy groups with ethnonyms reflecting traditional trades (Petulengro 1915–1916; Fraser 1992; Liégeois 1994; Marushiakova and Popov 1997).”

The interpretation of sources in the articles discussed above is preferential, since from Fraser (1992) what is retained is the endogamy allegation, while the exogamy hypothesis of the same author is discarded. In this regard, Fraser (1992), one of the sources favored by many genetic studies on Roma, indicates that exogamy could be an alternative hypothesis to be considered in the case of Roma:

... to attach prime importance to biological or genealogical criteria quickly leads to absurd demarcations: Gypsy populations, like others, have a mixture of ancestral strains. A pause for a mathematical calculation indicates that, over the period during which Gypsies have been in Europe, an average of no more than four marriages in every hundred being with non-Gypsies would have produced a proportion of some 70 per cent non-Gypsy ancestry among their present population in Europe. Three in every hundred would still make it 60 per cent. (6)

¹⁷ It is interesting to observe that for extending social sciences sources for referencing Roma endogamy, Morar et al. (2004) appeal to a publication from 1915–1916, skipping therefore the racial science from the interwar period.

In general, genetic studies ground their Roma-related premises on ethnographic, anthropological, linguistic, folkloristic, historical sources, and sometimes even on legends. Undocumented historical sources (“old European chronicles”) are good enough to be considered as “some indirect evidence” (hence evidence) of the current presumed Roma endogamy: “There is no documented history of their [Roma] early social organisation; however, old European chronicles already mention small groups of 100–300 people with horses and dogs, headed by ‘barons, kings or princes’ and provide some indirect evidence of tribal endogamy and hostilities between groups” (Kalaydjieva et al. 2005, 1086).

Furthermore, genetic research points out a connection between the past social organization of Roma (exemplified by old legends) and the current organization of the Roma population: the link between the past and the present is made by this historical legacy of endogamy that is seen as a continuous characteristic of Roma groups. Despite its weaknesses to stay as evidence, endogamy as a characteristic of Roma groups is the key premise and main reason for justifying Roma-related genetic research and selecting Roma individuals in genetic samples.

To summarize, Roma endogamy as seen by genetic papers is contradicted by the great linguistic diversity of Roma, their affiliations with all major religions, their occupational structure, which diversified under the global trends of modernization, and by the fact that marriages among people from different groups and social strata occurred throughout time. The febrile search for endogamous populations and of genetic isolates could rather be interpreted as the fear of geneticists after the Second World War of losing their object of study due to globalization, which brought about a multiplication of intergroup contacts (see, for example, Lipphardt 2014).

*The unbearable generalization: From convenience
samples to the Roma population*

Another type of trade-off in Roma-related genetic studies is connected to data interpretation of genetic samples. Although the research frame is in many cases that of the *Roma population in Europe*, a population circumscribed by its size, the genetic samples are not drawn

from the accredited overall figure (and territorial distribution) of the Roma group. The size of the Roma group is deployed in many genetic studies in order to have a common point of reference, but instead the effect is to produce a frame for the research universe. This number is unchanged and could be traced back to political-administrative sources (Council of Europe) from as long ago as 1994.¹⁸ The Council of Europe estimate of the Roma population is quoted as an authoritative source in genetic papers from my sample, albeit worded slightly differently:

- “About 8 million” in the text of the article and 8–10 million Roma in the abstract of Kalaydjieva et al. (2001);
- “8–10 million European Roma/Gypsies” in Morar et al. (2004);
- “8–10 million European Gypsies” in Kalaydjieva et al. (2005) in the summary and “around 10 million people” in the text.

An exception is made by the study of Gresham et al. (2001), which admits a possible lower estimate of 4 million Roma people in Europe, although acknowledging the CoE estimate of “10 million Roma.” Yet, the substantial difference between the two numbers is likely to discredit both numbers, rather than acknowledge either of them. Roma population size resulting from the census is refuted as unreliable both by social and policy research, as well as genetic studies in general. Genetic research relies on political estimates that could be even less trustful than census data, although the production of these estimates is not transparent. Bounding and anchoring the size of Roma in the CoE’s estimates, the Roma population in genetic research appears as a fixed object, which experiences neither an increase nor a decrease but remains stable over time since 1994. The 8–10 million size of European Roma seems to be an optimal number for geneticists, so that the Roma population can be considered as a genetic isolate. A population that is to be regarded as a genetic isolate, and consequently appropriate for the study of human variation in terms of endogamous groups, should theoretically and empirically be neither too big (as to resemble a “race”) nor too small (to be confused with inbreeding groups) (see Lipphardt 2014). Then, once the frame size of the Roma popula-

¹⁸ See the discussion in Chapter 4.

tion is employed in genetic research, the sampling strategies would be expected to stick to this frame in order to draw valid conclusions that would be applicable to the Roma population in Europe as a whole. In spite of this expectation, in genetic studies the selection of subjects per country is not in accordance with the distribution of the Roma population in Europe, as sketched out by the CoE (because the CoE estimate is taken as a population universal for most of the studies). Therefore, the findings of genetic research cannot be applicable to and valid for the overall Roma population, as it is often presented both in paper titles and texts, since these studies are using convenience samples based on available ethnological classifications, which do not allow for generalization.

Although geneticists describe Roma as a transnational ethnic minority across Europe, the samples are geographically disproportionate due to the selection of individuals primarily from Eastern Europe. Moreover, even in this region, Bulgaria seems to be the preferred country for sampling Roma in genetic research. For example, the study of Gresham et al. (2001), which strives to describe “Origins and Divergence of the Roma (Gypsies),” as its title acknowledges, uses a sample size of merely 295 people from which 248 are from Bulgaria, 27 from Spain, and 20 from Lithuania. Another example of convenience sampling accompanied by unbearable generalization is that of a medical genetic paper by Kalaydjieva et al. (1999), entitled “A Founder Mutation in the GK1 Gene is Responsible for Galactokinase Deficiency in Roma (Gypsies),” that draws general conclusions about Roma population after studying 130 people from Bulgaria. What seems even more intriguing in this last study is that the control group of Bulgarians consists of only 64 persons who are standing for the (entire) population of Bulgarians. It is not only that Roma are portrayed as a genetically “pure line” population, but this type of sample selection (with Roma and Bulgarian individuals) implies an equally “pure line” Bulgarian population, from which the 64 “representatives” were extracted. This objectification of other populations (in this case, Bulgarians) for contrasting them to Roma is usually encountered in genetic studies, which use control groups to differentiate among ethnic groups. Even the much larger sample of Morar et al. (2004), which has 1175 cases in a study

purporting to describe “Mutation History of the Roma/Gypsies,” comprised 785 of its subjects, or more than two-thirds, from Bulgaria, 283 from Hungary, 87 from Spain, and 20 from Lithuania. Despite such geographical distribution of subjects in the sample, conclusions of the research describe the Roma population living all over Europe. The subjects were selected more from Eastern Europe than from Western Europe, and a single country (Bulgaria) stands for the East. Not only are countries with a high estimated number of Roma omitted from the samples, but also the number of subjects chosen per country is not proportional either with the population size of the country, or with the estimated number of Roma in that country. Moreover, the sample size per country is so small that it might deem the research outcomes isolated, rather than treating the Roma population as a genetic isolate.

Nevertheless, not all genetic studies claim to be representative for an overall Roma population; however, those that do not assert representativeness (at least in the title) are to some extent exceptions. An example of such a study, which clearly circumscribes its reference immediately with the title, is “Mosaicism of a missense SCN1A mutation and Dravet syndrome in a Roma/Gypsy family” (Azmanov et al. 2010). It is not without importance that when genetic studies clearly mention the concrete extension of the research in the title (“a Roma/Gypsy family,” as it is in the above example), the number of citations is substantially smaller (nine citations) for such a study than for studies with titles that use Roma/Gypsies as a broad reference. Most of the titles of genetic papers refer to a generic Roma population even if genetic studies are not built on representative samples, but rather on a very small number of individuals often selected from isolated communities. In other words, a study presents itself in a better light when the reference is broad (such as the Roma population) rather than local, and with this strategy it gains scientific authority. In turn, it is likely that research is presented as macro-scale or continental in order to obtain more citations and to be more visible for mass media. As a general rule, in the genetic papers analyzed the research limits are not acknowledged and the readers are not aware of the risks associated with generalizing research findings beyond the samples.

To conclude, the broader aim of the genetic research in relation to Roma is to unveil historical issues, which are disputed or less documented: the origins of Roma and their history of migration through the centuries. Moreover, genetic papers also strive to address the scarcity of historical documents about the history of Roma and to recompose this history on the basis of genetic evidence. In doing so, genetic research, relying on laboratory work, retraces a genetic history of Roma migration in order to confirm linguistic theories about Roma origins and their migration. The role assumed by genetic studies is not only that of bringing genetic evidence for supporting the “Indian connection,” but some of the genetic papers also purport to arbitrate the debates from the social sciences regarding the origins of Roma: the prevalent (mainstream) theory of Indian origin (based on linguistic arguments) vs. the less acknowledged theories of local European origin and of the socially constructed character of Roma “otherness.”

The following quote from the study by Gresham et al. (2001) illustrates the active role played by genetics in solving the controversies constructed within the social sciences:

Nearly 45% of Y chromosomes belong to haplogroup VI-68, and a single lineage within that haplogroup, found across Romani populations, accounts for almost one-third of Romani males. A similar preservation of a highly resolved male lineage has been reported elsewhere only for Jewish priests (Thomas et al. 1998). Similarly, Asian-specific mtDNA haplogroup M is found in 13 of 14 Romani populations and accounts for 26.5% of maternal lineages in the Roma. *The data provide strong evidence of Asian origins, in contrast with claims that the Roma are a socially defined population of European descent* (Okely 1983; Wexler 1997). (1328; emphasis added)

Yet, Roma-related genetic research seems to give preference to certain research traditions from the social sciences, despite the fragile evidence that they offer. Since Gresham et al. (2001) justify the utility of their research findings with the potential application for medical genetics, it remains to be seen how the mediator role assumed by population genetic research would prove that findings about Roma origins are useful for medical applications.

Roma as subjects of medical genetic research

In some of the genetic articles, the origin and history of Roma are retraced from sampling among people who currently have genetic diseases, and it is assumed that these diseases are specific to Roma; hence the reconstruction of the group's historic unity is made along medical lines. However, the demarcation between population genetics (that narrates Roma origin and history from sampling among healthy individuals) and medical genetics research (that chooses samples from unhealthy individuals) is hardly fixed because references are circuitous between the two genetic branches of research. While in social science research, the making of the Roma group purports to assign specific characteristics to the group, such as poverty, archaic cultural traditions, nomadism, migration, or welfare dependency, medical genetics assigns Roma groupness along a series of hereditary diseases supposedly more prevalent among Roma than in others. Genetic research claims that the specificity and uniqueness of the Roma group (and, moreover, objective conclusions about Roma history and demography) derive from the study of common genetic diseases, which differentiate the group from others.

Indirectly and with careful wording, the implicit assumption of some medical genetic papers is that diseases specific to Roma present a health risk for children that might result from marriages having Roma as partners. The medical genetic studies carried out on small, non-representative, and non-randomized samples present their findings as if those referred to Roma at large. Moreover, some of the medical genetic studies convey an alarming tone, suggesting that due to specific genetic diseases of Roma, they might be a bad choice for marriage and for bearing children. The following quote, referring to galactokinase deficiency conducive to cataracts, can be read as a warning sign: "The P28T carrier rate in this endogamous population is approximately 5%, suggesting that the mutation may be an important cause of early childhood blindness in countries with a sizeable Roma minority" (Kalaydjieva et al. 1999, 1299). A few pages later in the study, the incidence of the mutation is revised to "4%–5%"; although this adjustment could appear small, in fact, the expected incidence of galactokinase deficiency would significantly decrease from 1 in 1,600 cases to 1 in 2,500 with the adjustment (1305). The study draws its conclusions about the

incidence of a rare disease in the Roma population by studying 130 Roma individuals from Bulgaria. However, some medical sources¹⁹ that I consulted suggest that galactokinase deficiency or Type II Galactosemia (discussed in the analyzed study) has potential consequences (formation of juvenile cataracts) only if it is untreated, and these consequences are milder than the classical Type I.

On the same topic of galactokinase deficiency, a later article by Hunter et al. (2002) emphasizes the risk of spreading diseases considered specific to Roma to all of Europe through “waves” of Roma migration:

The findings suggest that the mutation has spread with the early diaspora of the Roma throughout Europe. Superimposed on this old distribution pattern is the new migration wave of the last decade, with large numbers of Roma moving to Western Europe as a result of the economic changes in the East and the wars in former Yugoslavia. The changing demographic pattern of Romani minorities can be expected to lead to a homogenization of the incidence of “private” Romani disorders and founder mutations. (602)

This medical article refers to the highly politicized issue of “Roma migration” (or “Roma invasion,” as it is sometimes framed in mass media), as one of the main concerns of the authors seems to be that “the large number of Roma moving to Western Europe” would cause uniformization of the diseases in the countries of destination. Although the alleged “large number of Roma” moving to the West is not documented but only postulated, the genetic research exceeds its role and takes a medical-political stance. However, the study of Hunter et al. (2002) advances the same practical medical intervention for those affected by galactokinase as the study of Kalaydjieva et al. (1999): screening the newborn to check for mutation, followed by a diet and possibly medical treatment. In terms of practical utility, repeating

¹⁹ One source is the online *Genetics Home Reference* of the US National Library of Medicine, accessible at <http://ghr.nlm.nih.gov/condition=galactosemia>. Another consulted source is Galactosemia Foundation, accessible at http://galactosemia.org/Understanding_Galactosemia.php.

studies on the same issue and reaching the same conclusions brings few observable benefits, if any, for Roma subjects.

4. “THE SUN IS A GYPSY STOVE”²⁰ (CASE STUDY 4)

“Millions of people are now suspecting that their social prejudices are scientific facts after all.”

(Stephen Jay Gould)

A paper by Rushton, Čvorović, and Bons (2007), entitled “General mental ability in South Asians: Data from three Roma (Gypsy) communities in Serbia,” seems to be in line with the arguments from nineteenth century phrenology and scientific theories about race. Although the title indicates a study about South Asian people, the paper refers to three communities of Serbian Roma and to their low IQ uncovered through research, pointing to the biological closeness of Roma with South Asians and beyond (Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Iraq, Iran, the Gulf States, Near East, Turkey, and North Africa). The authors of this paper look for similarities between Serbian Roma and South Asian populations in order to discern whether “... the Roma (Gypsy) population of Serbia, like other South Asian population groups, average lower than Europeans on g, the general factor of intelligence...” (1). The way the main research question is framed is offensive, if not outright biased,²¹ as it indicates from the outset that Roma are to be relegated to the status of a group with a lower IQ, evidently lower than a “typical” European.

The sample of 323 persons used in the study is described both as a “large” sample and a “volunteer” sample. Yet, the sample consists of

²⁰ “The sun is a Gypsy stove” is the answer provided by a Roma subject to a *noun definition* test in an IQ examination in the study of Rushton et al. (2007, 6).

²¹ It seems that one of the authors of this article, P. Rushton, continues a line of research that was criticized by academics and scientists for racist implications. See, for example, Gannett (2004) and Lewontin (2000). Lewontin (2000) writes: “His [J. Philippe Rushton’s] claim was that Africans are duller but sexier than Europeans and Asians because evolution in a tropic climate endowed them with smaller brains and larger genitalia” (34).

“volunteers” since the participants were not financially compensated for a considerable amount of time allocated to accomplish the many and diverse measurement tasks, “but small gifts were given, such as coffee for the adults and candy for the children” (4). The authors mentioned that some subjects complained of “headaches,” which researchers interpreted as provoked by the difficulty of the applied tests, but the authors excluded as a potential influencing factor the lack of motivation (since participants have not been remunerated for their time), the conditions of testing (*inter alia*, measurements with calipers), cultural biases, and the language in which the test was administered. Nowhere in the paper did the authors specify either the population or the universe from which the sample was drawn, or the total number of the Roma population, which the sample claims to represent. Criteria for selecting the three localities and recruiting people were also not specified. However, besides these substantial methodological limitations (that are not acknowledged), the study claims to be the first “comprehensive estimate of the IQ of an *adult Roma*” (10; italics in the original). Nevertheless, an age interval between 16 and 66, with 66% women research subjects, reflects an unbalanced sample for representing the adult population both in regard to age and gender. It is also interesting to observe that participants defined as Roma “speak Serbian as their mother tongue and Romanian as a second language, and do not speak Romani at all” (5). Yet, research findings based on this very specific sample do not prevent the authors from making claims valid for the “Roma (Gypsy) population of Serbia” (1).

Scrutinizing this study further can be instructive; it can show how data are constructed from previous data of other studies, how generalizations about an entire population are made starting from uncertain or small numbers, as well as how sources of data are obliterated and information from documenting sources is presented in a misleading manner. In the introduction, the authors bring a series of data from other sources supposedly supporting their research. These data are used as a base for generalization and for transferring isolated opinions or uncertain numbers in order to describe an entire Roma group. Thus, an ambiguously quoted source leaves the impression that there is a wide consensus among psychologists regarding the (supposed) lower IQ of Roma children:

According to Save the Children (2001), the situation had not changed much in the interim: 62% of Roma had not completed primary education. It reported that school psychologists who administered the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R) found that Roma children averaged an IQ of about 70, which placed many in the retarded category (p. 164). (4)

I checked the original source (Save the Children 2001) and found that the IQ score of 70 that was brought as evidence by Rusthon et al. (2007) is provided by a single psychologist (not by a community of psychologists as the use of the plural insinuates) who works at a special school in the Novi Beograd district of Belgrade; the opinion of the psychologist is the following: “Where the IQ of Roma children is concerned, the law backs me up. They are unable to score more than 70 points on the test, which places them in the slightly retarded category” (Save the Children 2001, 164). We cannot but observe that the data from Save the Children 2001 report brought in to support the study is more ambiguous than clarifying. The following questions arise: What type of schools were visited for testing Roma children? How many children were tested by the psychologist(s)? How could data, derived from an unknown sample size, be extrapolated to (all) Roma children from Serbia?

Depicting Roma children with low IQ scores prepares the readers and lays the foundation for showing similar results in the case of Roma adults: the study “General mental ability in South Asians: Data from three Roma (Gypsy) communities in Serbia” (Rushton et al. 2007) confirms the expectations of the authors, that of a low IQ among Roma adults (an average of 70). The expectations were set low from the beginning, and it is discernible from the design of the study: the IQ tests used in the field research are for “culture-reduced” people and elaborated especially for children, mentally impaired adolescents, and the elderly. It is curious, given the advancement of science and the rejection of phrenology as a pseudo-science by most scientists today, that the Roma participants in a study from 2004 were physically measured with calipers for assessing the external size of the head (length, width, and height), and using these measurements their cranial capacity was calculated.

In this study, among the comparison groups, Serbian pre-school children and “neurologically impaired adults” were brought in the anal-

ysis alongside “White, Indian, Colored, and Black South African high school students, and Black South African undergraduates” (10). The comparison of Serbian children with Roma adults infantilizes Roma subjects and further on, by the generalization that the authors made, such a comparison transmits the idea of the inferiority of the Roma group in relation to “Europeans.” In its logic, this comparison is similar to that between “white” children and “blacks” in the history of IQ tests in the US. The choice of “white children” as a group of comparison with “black adults” has deliberately been constructed in order to proclaim the inferiority of African Americans (Gould 1996).

As originally planned and methodologically envisioned, the research findings show that Roma adults scored not very far from Serbian preschool children having, *inter alia*, deficiencies and a limited capacity for abstract thinking. To exemplify this low capacity for abstraction, the authors established that on the *noun definition test* an answer such as “the sun is a Gypsy stove” should be considered as an indication of “less or lack of abstraction” (6). On the contrary, I consider it a remarkable metaphor that displays creativity, originality, and indeed the capacity for abstraction.

The study seems to aim at justifying the discriminatory practices of segregating Roma children into special schools and offers grounds for preserving the special education arrangements for Roma children in Serbia.²² The overplacement of Roma pupils in special schools and classes is a widespread practice in educational systems in countries of CEE (Czech Republic, Hungary, Serbia, and Slovakia), a practice made possible by the often improper psychological testing at an early age (see, for example, REF 2012). Finally, I cannot but subscribe to the wonderful analysis of Gould (1996) that demonstrates how the entire history of measuring intelligence as a single number (the IQ quotient—*g*) was one of the most biased and fabricated—if not simply fraudulent—research traditions, whose main aim was to label oppressed racial, ethnic, gender, or social groups as inferior.

The four case studies presented in this chapter allow for some generalization. Thus, scientific and expert discourse about Roma after

²² An estimate provided by an OSI (2010) study is that one-third of the pupils receiving special education in Serbia are Roma.

1990 becomes self-referential and isomorphic to a large extent. This discourse is advanced mainly through scientific papers which rely on previous scientific work rather than scrutinizing empirical reality (as defined by the exchange of significations among actors). The scientific and expert self-reference is made possible with the advance of interdisciplinarity, in which different types of specialized discourses incorporate the narratives developed in other fields. In this regard, social science discourse draws heavily on Romani Studies, with which it intersects on several points. On the other hand, genetics discourse incorporates the main storylines developed in Romani Studies, which in return rely heavily on genetics findings in arguing for the single origin (as opposed to multiple origins) of Roma and establishing a point in time of departure from the Asian continent. The most eclectic field, that of policy studies, bases its discourse on an amalgamation of narratives from the neighboring social sciences, and moreover, produces data to sustain this imported or taken-for-granted knowledge.

Chapter 7

Visual Depictions of Roma in Expert Publications

The adoption of visual means by policy studies is concomitant with a global process in which a visual approach to the social world is gaining prominence over a textual approach of understanding. Beginning with the nineteenth century, the use of photography signifies professionalization of discourse and becomes a rife practice among various scientific disciplines, with the role of bringing qualified expertise (Tagg 1993). The professionalization of policy analysis, as a distinct and specific scientific field, responds to this visual trend and brings an increased usage of visualizations in framing policy topics, themes, and recommendations for solving issues of public interest.

Roma policy literature is a specific genre and field of expertise that emerged as a result of the attention dedicated to Roma by policy scholars. This literature started to develop at the beginning of the regime change in the 1990s in Central and Southeastern Europe, and more recently, it expanded in Western Europe as well. Roma-related policy literature has reached its peak with the Decade of Roma Inclusion, an initiative of governments and international organizations aimed at improving the life chances of Roma. Roma-related policy analysis emerged in connection with these developments and as a result of setting Roma as a target group of research and policy intervention. This field of policy studies is increasingly making use of visual products (photographs, videos, movies, power point presentations, posters, leaf-

lets). In visiting websites dedicated to Roma projects or policies, one may find a collection of visual products that deliver messages.

As a by-product of Roma policy literature, and coextensively with its development, a Roma group image emerged. Although these policies do not explicitly aim to shape a collective image of Roma, the result of Roma-oriented policies (guided by policy research) is that of producing *iconic images* associated with Roma identity in the public consciousness. Roma policy literature becomes a space in which a specific way of portraying *Roma identity* is developed and further on disseminated in larger societal circles. Images produced by policy studies are transferred to the public by the self-promotion tools of the producers and by the interest of mass media to circulate sensationalist images related to Roma.

The shaping of a public Roma image through policy studies is mainly an *exercise externally accomplished and from the top down*: this image is not necessarily the result of public relations or of branding campaigns made by Roma NGOs and political parties, but it is externally constructed by actors that have neither a mandate nor responsibility in representing Roma such as, *inter alia*, the World Bank, UNDP, UNICEF, and the European Commission. As shown in the previous chapter, most relevant (in terms of influence) organizations that target, describe, and define Roma in policy literature are international organizations. Due to their specific missions, these organizations are institutionally equipped to categorize and see Roma as a uniform and homogenous group. As powerful and resourceful organizations, these corporate bodies play an influential role as opinion leaders in the policy community, which includes governmental and non-governmental representatives, as well as academics and journalists, among others. Sometimes, policy analyses about Roma are jointly published in collective multi-agency and multi-country policy reports indicating a discursive and imagistic isomorphism in regard to classifications and representations of Roma. As corporate publications, it is not always clear who assumes the responsibility (if any) for the texts and images circulated, and who speaks on behalf of Roma. A recent example of a corporate study about Roma is the 2012 FRA and UNDP report. This report acknowledges the authorship in the following manner:

This document has been prepared for the European Commission; however, it reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein. This report draws on the results of the UNDP/World Bank/EC regional Roma 2011 survey. However, the report was prepared by FRA and UNDP and does not necessarily represent the views of the World Bank. (copyright page)

From the many agencies that played any role in the production of this report, in the end, the responsibility for the report remains floating and the organizations involved actively seek to keep some distance.

In policy literature about Roma, two opposing commandments seem to compete. On the one hand, there is the request to adhere to scientific neutrality and a value-free type of writing, and to conform to the sobriety of the scientific style by discarding photographic representations that may guide the reading and may bias the lector. On the other hand, in order to grab attention, there is a willingness to use colorful, abundant, and sometimes artistic photos in (some) expert papers. The usage of plenty of photos in policy reports,¹ which are otherwise rather technical (using, for example, statistical quantitative data), leads to a quick *fixing of the reference* by visual means and anchoring to visual clues the understanding of the reader; the main topic of the text is revealed rather by photography than by arguments, tables, or graphs.

With the exception of research methodologies, which deliberately use visual means, expert publications rarely utilize photographs beyond the front and back covers (that sometimes have more abstract than figurative images). Expert books and reports are rather austere in the use of images when the topic of these publications does not require photographic instantiation. The scarcity of images in scientific or expert publications is meant to exemplify moderation and the objectivity of the academic style, characterized by a manner of presenting the text in

¹ See, for example, the following reports that abundantly use photos: UNDP (2006b), UNICEF (2007, 2011), CURS, Romani CRISS, and REF (2012).

contrast with the vivid style of journalism, for example, the latter being a type of writing that makes rich use of photos. One of the reasons why scientific and expert writing is not associated with photos (except when the topic itself deals with photography or with visual analysis, which may make the photos necessary as an object of study in itself) is the general idea that texts, relying on words and numbers, are more qualified to demonstrate scientific arguments and to present lines of thought than visual images. A simple Google Images search with “policy paper” as the query shows that most of the literature in this field has no images and the covers are designed with abstract images. Moreover, those reports which do not have images on the covers are less likely to have images inside.

Policy expert publications about Roma, although circumscribed by academic discourse, are rather an *exception* to the above rules, as many of these reports contain photographs of people on covers or inside the text. The use of photos in Roma policy reports raises questions about why writings that are prepared through academic and expert methodologies are in need of photos. A possible answer is that photography is not value-free by itself (Goffman 1979, Barthes 1984). According to Barthes (1984), photography has the following functions: “to inform, to represent, to surprise, to cause, to signify, to provoke desire” (28). Which of these functions fits best with the visual depictions of Roma in policy papers? So far, there is a lack of analysis and criticism in regard to the visual representation of Roma in expert publications. While images and visual symbols of Roma in cinematographic production, television, museums, and printed media were often criticized by scholars (e.g., Gay y Blasco 2008) or activists, a similar discussion or a critical analysis about Roma-related images in the public policy field did not take place. There is no critical comparison between Roma images from policy literature, and images from movies and mass media production, although they sometimes converge in transmitting similar clichés about Roma. The question whether policy expert publications follow the sensationalist approach specific to journalists can be raised insofar as many of the Roma images are similar between the two fields. It seems that not only advertisers use photographs for impressing and catching the attention of the audience, but also policy analysts use similar *commercial* methods for selecting images that they consider representative and appealing to the public:

Interestingly, it is not merely commercial advertisers who have recourse to these pictorial methods. Governments and non-profit organizations employ the same devices in order to convey a message through pages, posters, and billboards; so do radical groups and so do private persons with photography as a hobby or a calling. (It is rather wrong, alas, to say that only advertisers advertise. Indeed, even those concerned to oppose commercial versions of the world must pictorialize their arguments through images which are selected according to much the same principles as those employed by the enemy). (Goffman 1979, 27)

The image ensued from the amalgamation of descriptions of Roma as a (target) group in policy literature creates a uniform appearance that continuously fuels and refuels the (mostly negative) social representations of Roma. The visual representation of the Roma group in policy literature is a gross *oversimplification of the diversity* that, otherwise, is acknowledged at the discursive level (even in the documents that use photographic clichés). In policy literature Roma are exclusively framed as poor, unemployed, uneducated, unhealthy, and living in precarious housing conditions. Therefore, policy analysis chiefly produces and circulates a stereotyped image of Roma by narrowing the reader's attention to focus on Roma as a group of marginal and vulnerable people. Policy analysts and, following them, policymakers create *definitional boundaries* of the Roma group; they maintain these borders by a series of negative social attributes that delineate who is inside and who is outside of the group, and, moreover, who essentially represents the group. The social image of Roma built on essentialist premises is actively created by academics and journalists. The essentialization of Roma identity seems to represent an *institutional demise of universalist policies* of some international organizations, which put too much focus on "Roma issues" instead of focusing on universal human rights.

The uniform and monolithic image of Roma as created by policy literature has gained the hegemony of presenting and representing a spoiled Roma identity to the detriment of possible alternative images. This general public image of Roma prevented the emergence of a balanced alternative and depoliticized image of Roma. Targeting Roma in policy analyses and in sectoral policy interventions greatly contributed to the creation of boundaries of belonging for Roma, and these bound-

aries reduced Roma to a stigmatized identity, that of a poor, excluded, uncivilized, and *radically different* “Other.”

1. READING PHOTOGRAPHY: PRETEXT, TEXT, AND CONTEXT

The usage of photography in expert publications about Roma is related to a general supportive role of photography in a text, that of making an argument or building a case on a certain topic. It seems that the role of photography in expert publications is meant to conceal a textual, a methodological, or an argumentative *deficit* in making a plea for a specific issue.

The deficit to be covered in Roma-related policy publications that make use of photography comes from the absent, tautological, or taken-for granted definition of Roma: definitional problems need to be supported by visual stimuli. More precisely, the recourse to photography in policy papers about Roma seems to be done with the following aims:

1. To quickly familiarize the reader by showing who the Roma as a subject are.
2. To fix the reference in the readers’ conscience so that the object of the study—Roma, in our case—becomes self-evident and more easily recognizable than would be by the text only.
3. To support the ideas transmitted by the text (poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, etc.).
4. To claim the representativeness through an iconic character of what is represented, or to take the representativeness for granted.
5. To enable the recognition of a specific type of literature.

Far from being an arbitrary choice, the selection of the photos reflects the (visual) policy of an organization that posts photos on its websites and includes images in publications (such as reports, policy papers, articles, brochures, posters, leaflets, banners, and so on). The photographic portfolio as a whole and each distinct photo present and represent the organizational vision about the portrayed Roma subject. Especially the most common, the most frequently used, the ubiquitous images are the key descriptors of an organizational vision. The photo contains not merely the photographer’s individual ideas or intentions

and not even mainly his/her individual point of view, but, as Bourdieu et al. (1990) argue, the photo is also a representation of collective modalities of understanding. In this regard, photos are more than strategic choices of the organizations; they reflect expectations of the larger public in regard to what is iconic for the Roma as a group. Therefore, in Roma-related publications the choice of photos is linked both to the way in which the organizations deem to frame Roma, but also to general public beliefs and opinions about Roma.

The relation between text and photos in policy papers and expert publications about Roma is not unilateral but twofold: what is sought is a connection between visual and textual depictions. If the photo is key to reading the text, then it should also apply that the text is key to seeing the image. Barthes (1980) indicates that the text that accompanies a photo² has a repressive function, which restricts the freedom of the readers in investing their own meanings in what an image may signify.

Examining the organizational portfolios of photographs is not about analyzing the photographer's products, but about investigating the organization as a group of people who share a common vision. The method of searching for the meanings of visual images in policy literature can be called *visual policy analysis*, as it focuses on meanings that an organization as a group with its own ideology invests in images. Schmidt (2012), who coined the term "visual politics" in relation to representations circulated by mass media to a large audience, has a similar approach of inquiry: she defines visual politics as the "relation between visual text and social context, and its connection to power" (78).

Publications that appear under organizational auspices (whether or not they mention the authors) have a disclaimer policy for the papers, which does not apply to the photos but only to the text. The disclaimer policy, as applied to the text, dissociates opinions and statements of the authors from those of the publishing organizations. Thus, regarding the text there is a prudential policy of certain sponsoring and publishing institutions, yet there is no similar caution related to pho-

² Barthes' suggestion is supposed to apply just to the name/title given to a photo and not for larger passages of text.

tographs. In the disclaimer policy, there is an implicit recognition of authenticity in photography, and therefore an adherence to a concept that photography naturalizes the subject by revealing it; one cannot make a disclaimer to the image of the natural. If the text is man-made (and man can make errors), the photo is understood as representing the pure truth or a revealed reality, which cannot be mistaken: "... in Photography I can never deny that *the thing has been there*" (Barthes 1984, 76; italics in original). Moreover, if biases can be imputed to the authors of the text, in terms of their approach, writing style, usage of certain words instead of others, and utilization or lack of quotations, then the photo pertains *par excellence* to a register of objectivity to which no complaint can be made. The naturalistic understanding of photography is due to the reception of photography as objective because it relies on the non-intervention of human action: "... the absence of a code clearly reinforces the myth of photographic 'naturalness': the scene is there, captured mechanically, not humanly (the mechanical is here a guarantee of objectivity)" (Barthes 1980, 278).

The choice of photographs is part of the organizational policy, as this choice reflects the visual identity of the organization by the fact that the images depict the organizational subject of knowledge and action, and create the boundaries of the organization's field of action. The visual identity of an organization, in turn, should be in accordance with its organizational mandate, mission, and aims, and should reflect these purposes by the symbolism associated with the photographs used in its publications. For instance, an organization involved in the field of poverty reduction, in order to reflect the organizational logic, will probably choose from those photos that best describe its target group—the poor—or perhaps images of successful actions that the organization has had in changing the status of the poor. To take another example, an educational organization aiming to broaden access to quality education for its recipients will probably choose those photos that reflect the educational status of the target group or depict actions through which the organization was involved successfully in fulfilling its objectives.

The use of photography in expert publications about Roma serves as indicator to an audience (policymakers, organizations from the same field or from the academic community) that a particular organization has specialized/professionalized in "Roma issues." In other cases,

the use of photographs has a legitimizing function for an organization searching to enter a new field or to consolidate and reposition its presence in the field. The use of photographs of Roma is an indication that the organization became knowledgeable on the topic; the photo itself, when placed in policy reports, plays the role of expert knowledge. The use of photographic representations of Roma is more likely to appear in policy research papers in which the legitimizing function of the expert knowledge prevails over an instrumental use of research findings. Analyzing research on immigration policy but extending its conclusions to policy literature in general, Boswell (2009) considers that the symbolic use of research for legitimizing organizations is a common practice. Following this idea, expert reports with prevailing photographs pertain to a type of research that aims at legitimizing the expert status of both the author(s) and organization(s), rather than finding solutions for concrete questions. Photography appears to be used to add value to a publication and thus to enhance the image of the organization in the competition for attracting funds or for positioning itself in a field of expertise. Therefore, investing in photography and the symbolic economic value it creates pays off. In the competition for demonstrating expertise, the excessive use of photographic portfolios of images at times leaves the substantive content of the policy subordinate to the pictures, which speak more than the text.

The main function of visually depicting Roma in policy reports seems to be that of representing the “typical Roma.” When photos are on the front cover of policy publications, these images have a similar role as those in advertising: “selling” the product, or, in other words, making the publication appealing, interesting to the public, and at the same time putting the organization in the spotlight and making it appear valuable and worthwhile. The advertising function of the photos is even more evident when resources are invested in a professional cover design, with special attention and considerable financial allocation to the photos. The placement of photos on the front cover of a publication plays a similar role as the title for the publication as a whole: capturing attention and transmitting a message. The cover photo sends the main message to the public in a condensed, concentrated, and essentializing manner, instead of conveying it through the text. Beyond the symbolic message transmitted through a cover photo, the realism of the image in itself has a message of credibility that the

photo is expected to lend to the text. Reading photos while ignoring the text is a lecture in itself: “the picture itself is designed to tell its little story without much textual assistance” (Goffman 1979, 26).

Selection of photographs for analysis

Publications using photographs in order to speak about Roma multiplied in the last decade, and texts about Roma accompanied by images are more present in public contexts. Among these publications, policy documents are often posted in electronic format, especially on the websites of organizations that address Roma as a target group, and largely distributed on social and professional networks. However, not all publications subsumed under the Roma policy literature use photographs, and there are some examples of papers that do not use images of Roma or do not use images at all.

In what follows, I will address only marginally the substantive content of policy papers, including merits or pitfalls in regard to Roma inclusion, and instead I will consider these documents mainly for their contribution to the socio-political and journalistic construction of a Roma identity. The photos examined for this analysis are not part of any photo-documentary project about Roma; these photographs usually had neither descriptions, nor interpretations, nor any justification for their usage. In addition, there is no explicit visual methodology and there are no explanations provided about the selection of these photos. There are a few cases³ when Roma-related photography is used as a documentary technique. Even in these cases of policy related photo-journalism that is intended to explicitly convey a message to the audience, one can still

³ For example, the “Roma Realities Decade 2005–2015” photographic project of the World Bank and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation is available at http://www.romadecade.org/cms/upload/file/8525_file1_roma-realities-%25E2%2580%2593decade-2005-2015.pdf. Another example of a Roma-related photo-project is the “Chachipe” contest initiated by the Open Society Institute in 2008. Although this last project aimed to combat Roma-related stereotypes, it is doubtful that it succeeded; on the contrary, it seems to have boosted circulation of stereotypical images since expert organizations publishing about Roma used photos from the “Chachipe” portfolio. See the website of the “Chachipe” contest at <http://chachipe.org/>.

find visual descriptions of Roma abundant in stereotypes, producing a Roma image that becomes a public reference. My analysis of a few photos below is therefore not about the documentary method as an investigative research methodology, but it is an analysis of photos that illustrate policy documents or websites. I selected photos that are used for the general *design* of policy-related publications (if we consider publications not only as a printed product but also as an electronic product addressing a public). The primary interest, thus, is the analysis of Roma photos in policy literature, as well as the interplay between the explicit descriptions and definitions of Roma provided in the analyzed documents, on the one hand, and the photography used to depict them on the other hand. I also pay attention to the *locus* of the photographs in the symbolic economy of publications by taking into account the visibility of photos displayed on covers, in the text, as well as on websites. The selection of images is done according to the *criteria of visibility*, hence I have chosen images that are highly likely to be seen and, consequently, are likely to trigger recognition of a public Roma image.

The next level of analysis aims to describe the relation between the photo and accompanying text. In the case of report covers, the title of the publication gives an immediate denotation of the photography, but sometimes the entire content of the policy report is summed up by the cover photo. If the executive summary of a policy paper is the shortcut to its content, then the cover photo is the shortest and most straightforward link to an instantaneous understanding of the whole text. When seen on the cover, the photograph appears as a *prise de réalité* of the topic itself.

The appraisal of photos, placed on covers or inside the text of policy publications about Roma, allows us to glimpse how Roma are seen through the organizational lens of the (often collective) producers. The choice of photos by organizational actors, such as the UNICEF, UNDP, and World Bank, points out their role as opinion leaders in the policy community and indicates their power to influence public opinion.

The photos chosen as case studies for the in-depth analysis below were selected in order to address the following analytical tasks: (1) reflect public representations of Roma, having acquired the characteristics of an icon; (2) convey similar representations of Roma as mass media; (3) have a stigmatization effect for the individuals on the photos and for Roma at large (through inference and generalization).

I have not selected⁴ the most biased images representing Roma in policy reports, but those that fit well with the prototype of the most often encountered and circulated Roma images in public contexts.

2. ROMA IMAGES IN POLICY LITERATURE

Roma girl writing in a schoolbook

The photo, which I named “Roma Girl writing in a schoolbook,” is the cover for a 2010 UNICEF policy paper.⁵ The photo depicts a Roma girl reading and writing in an alphabet book or a primer.

The photograph is a portrait, and part of the girl’s head is out of the frame. The girl is dressed in a red T-shirt and we are left to guess whether the photo is taken in a school environment, perhaps in a classroom. The pen that the girl uses to write in her book is a cheap pen, one of the most common ones in school supply shops. The book is a primer, probably for the first grade of school, as the operation of circling with the pen seems to be a simple task of recognition of objects in an elementary school curriculum or even in kindergarten. The focus of the photo is on the primer as the girl is not looking into the camera but she is concentrated on (or appears to be absorbed by) the task given as a pedagogical instruction. In fact, the impression on the girl’s face is one of fear of making a mistake or not accomplishing correctly the task given by an authority figure, probably the teacher (missing from the picture), if not by the photographer. As the photo is a color image, one may observe that the girl’s skin color is visibly of a darker shade. What one may assume, given the ordinary pen used as well as the dress code, is that girl comes from a rather poor family. What is therefore presented is the image of a poor girl and, as we are given the clue of darker skin color, the image of a poor Roma girl in an educational setting.

⁴ I have contacted by email the World Bank, UNICEF, and UNDP for asking permission to use photographs from their publications. I have not received answers from WB and UNICEF to my request; UNDP advised me to contact the photographer.

⁵ The photo can be accessed at http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/ROMA_PAPER_FINAL_LAST.pdf. The photographer is Zoran Jovanović Mačak.

The title of the study, with the above-described photograph as the cover, reads: "Towards Roma Inclusion: A Review of Roma Education Initiatives in Central and South-Eastern Europe." The photograph splits the title in two parts, with the second part of the title ("A Review of Roma Education Initiatives in Central and South-Eastern Europe") positioned under the photograph. The message of the report is mainly given by the first part of the title: "Towards Roma Inclusion." At the bottom of the page the slogan "unite for children," the logo and name of the organization (UNICEF) can be observed.

As with most of the photos in policy research papers, this one also identifies Roma by skin color, hence highlighting where to look for a visible difference of Roma. Bluntly, the complexion of the girl is what makes her stand for a Roma girl. But the photo should also send a message of inclusion and should suggest the relation between inclusion and education. In other words, the message that readers should receive is that staying in school is conducive to Roma inclusion. What we are not told about the girl in the image is what type of school she is attending, whether her colleagues are poor or rich, if they have a similar darker complexion as her, and if they have access to good teachers and to good school infrastructure. The simple fact that she is in school is assumed to be enough to convince the readers of the very idea that the girl is on the way "towards inclusion." Therefore, the assumption is that simply school participation and mere presence in a school environment would be enough for Roma to achieve social success (a possible meaning of inclusion?). In this leitmotif of attracting Roma to school one can see the policymakers' belief (shared with the majority of public opinion) that Roma do not want to attend school, but once attracted to the formal environment of the school, all the societal ills embedded in poverty (the girl is poor and not only Roma) will be cured.

Beyond the educational "possibilism" message (see Nash 2003) that the association between the photo and the title suggests (namely, that education alone could overcome social inequality), there is another aspect, which puts the cover photo in accordance with the title. This second element of the photograph that contributes decisively to aligning the image in concordance with the title of the report is the primer. On the one hand, the image of a primer or alphabet book is frequently chosen to stand for depicting educational purposes and, more precisely,

for illustrating basic education. A book will probably be more appropriate for representing higher level of education as, for example, many universities use books in their logos as symbols. On the other hand, the choice of the primer (and not of a book) sends the message that for Roma (in Central and South-Eastern Europe, to remain focused on the title) gaining the basic skills in literacy and numeracy should be *the* objective of “Roma Education Initiatives,” as the title announces. Stressing basic skills is in agreement with the UNICEF mission of universalizing access to primary or basic education, but emphasizing this level of education in conjunction with educational initiatives addressing Roma sets a very low and not ambitious goal for policy intervention. Teaching Roma how to read, write, and count as a main objective of public policy means to keep very low expectations in regard to an entire group of people, and to ignore that acquiring merely the basic skills in an increasingly competitive society is not favorable to any meaningful inclusion (whatever the understanding of the term may be). Such an objective also ignores that in most European countries mandatory education is currently the completion of 10 to 12 grades.

Setting low expectations is rather common in policy-making related to Roma. A recent example is the European Commission document that addressed the governments of EU member states, entitled “An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020.”⁶ In the chapter “EXPRESSING THE EU AMBITION: SETTING ROMA INTEGRATION GOALS,” under the heading “Access to education,” the goal is to “ensure that all Roma children complete at least primary school” (5). Roma who “at least” have accomplished primary education are still very likely to fail socially and to thicken the lines of an underqualified and unemployable work force, or ‘reserve army’ (see Bowles and Gintis 1977) of the capitalist economy; setting basic education as the final goal for Roma is unlikely to change their economic and social marginalization. In regard to Roma pupils, some of the teachers also have low expectations often based on first impression (Pygmalion effect), and it seems that policymakers design policy documents on the same grounds as these school teachers.

⁶ Document available at http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/discrimination/docs/com_2011_173_en.pdf.

For the reasons above, I consider the girl with the primer a stereotyping image in regard to Roma. The UNICEF visual representation of Roma is abundant in stereotypical images, not only in regard to Roma and education, but also illustrating Roma, *inter alia*, as beggars, children working on streets, very poorly dressed, and living in terrifying living conditions (e.g., see images from the 2007 UNICEF report). All these photographic instances are certainly part of reality, but emphasizing this particular part of reality creates a deeply negative general image of the Roma group, which leads to the formation or maintenance of stereotypes. Presenting predominantly only one facet of Roma means omitting or overshadowing other perspectives that could alternatively shape a more positive and accurate image of the Roma group as a whole. UNICEF also provides photographic portfolios and textual descriptions of Roma as success stories, but this positive view did not gain the status of an iconic image as negative representations did. Roma children reading alphabet books became representative images of the relation between Roma and education, encountered not only in UNICEF publications but also in many other governmental and non-governmental documents and websites, as well as in numerous products of Roma and non-Roma NGOs. This image of a Roma child reading a primer became a *policy icon* that frames the understanding, the expectations, and the policy actions in regard to Roma education.

Children by the garbage dumpsite

A photo appears on the World Bank website, accompanying a short text with the following title: “On the occasion of International Roma Day, April 8, The World Bank’s Roma team reflects on the state and significance of Roma inclusion.”⁷ The text on the website starts with an interpretation of the photo:

The dark-haired girl looking confidently into the lens can’t be much older than six or seven. She stares intently at the camera, her face full of both hope and determination. In this she is no different than other European children, yet the uncollected garbage and shacks in

⁷ Document available at <http://go.worldbank.org/Z553E4WTC0>.

the background highlight that she faces no ordinary challenges in living up to her dreams and aspirations. The girl is Roma and lives in a segregated Roma community in Slovakia. She is much more likely to live in poverty than a non-Roma girl of her age.

The description authoritatively labels the girl as Roma, although the text does not explain why the girl should be considered as such, neither why her locality is a Roma community, nor what makes the girl and her community possess Roma ethnic markers beyond the mere labeling of the narrator (who is not named in the text). The child is de-Europeanized by the assumption that only “hope and determination” is what she has in common with Europeans, while the rest of her characteristics, therefore, are non-European. By extension, this process of de-Europeanization applies to the entire group that the child is supposed to represent—the entire Roma group that needs to be included. There is no continuation of the girl’s story beyond the description, and the text that follows jumps to the discussion of percentages and statistics describing the Roma group (leaving aside the fact that there is no source for the data). The photo is a pretext for a quantitative narration. What this implies is that the circumstances of the main characters are typical for Roma children, and, moreover, Roma communities can be commonly found in such environments. The garbage dumpsite, as well as living and playing in garbage dumps, become representative conditions in which Roma live as the text is a narration that speaks about a group and exemplifies their specificity by situating Roma children in a garbage dumpsite. What makes the audience believe that the photo portrays a Roma girl is the context: the girl next to her who is half naked (similarly, another child in the background seems to be naked), and of course the garbage that occupies about half of the visible space of the photo. The naked child leitmotif (also appearing in many others policy publications) is a powerful symbolic image for the uncivilized, an icon meant to shock the civilized audience and to express a radical difference between an uncivilized Roma group and a civilized non-Roma counterpart.

The use of the image is even more inappropriate when considering the rationale of the article (which the photo accompanies): the celebration of April 8, the International Roma Day. Unfortunately, people living by garbage dumpsites are to be found in Europe as well as in

the US or elsewhere, but when it is about celebrating the national day it is less common to bring into focus the most despicable situations speaking about that nation. Usually, people show their best in celebratory moments, and efface, forget, or put in brackets the most tragic, unpleasant, and dire situations that are part of their lives.

What the picture also suggests by the absence of a parent or an adult figure is the idea of children left to play unattended in garbage without adult supervision. The photo rather transmits a shaming message for the entire Roma group because they allow situations such as the one described in the photo to happen.

Besides, even though the photo shows a significant environmental issue that threatens the life of people, nowhere in the text is the topic of environment and health taken into account. Instead, the main argument of the text, with the photo as its pretext, is that the economic calculus should be the main reason for states to seek to redress the degrading living conditions of people (in this case, those labeled as Roma).

The photo is meant to signify the state of Roma inclusion in 2011, as the title of the article indicates. Moreover, the photo is emblematic for an entire group as it is used in this context, in which the main reference is made to Roma as a group of 10–12 million people. Although there are certainly a number of Roma (and non-Roma) living near garbage dumps, it is doubtful that such precarious circumstances can be a typical situation or can accurately describe the status of an entire group numbering 10–12 million people.

The smoking Roma

A photograph appears in a UNDP publication titled “At Risk: Roma and the Displaced in Southeast Europe.”⁸ The cover design is based on images by Andrej Ban and Daniela Rusnok, as the document indicates. The picture shows a man, in his fifties or even older, smoking a cigarette, looking into the void, very much engaged in his own thoughts. The man has an expression of resignation and dissatisfaction with his current situation. A walking stick rests on his body. Immediately near

⁸ On the inside cover of UNDP (2006a), the photo appears in sepia. Document available at <http://www.eurasia.undp.org/content/dam/rbec/docs/At-risk-Roma-and-the-displaced-in-Southeast-Europe.pdf>.

him, one can see what is probably a hut, and the presence of the hut near the main character is signaled by other huts visible a bit further. The character is credible as a smoker; he is not simulating the act but performing it, and this is not a photographic rehearsal but the very “stage” of his life. In the background of the picture one may guess the silhouette of a child, and the contours of the child are blurred by the abundance of light and perhaps by the smoke surrounding the gaze both of the reader as well as of the character. The photo on the electronic report is in sepia toning. On the UNDP website, however, the photo appears in full color. As the photo does not have a caption, supposedly the title of the report (“At Risk: Roma and the Displaced in Southeast Europe”), which is placed immediately above the photo, is associated with the image. In other words, the title explains the image, and the image should have connotations which assist the creation of the text’s meaning. Therefore, according to the title we should consider the character of the photo representing Roma and, in the meantime, representing the displaced because the title refers to these two categories of subjects. What is it exactly about the character that makes him representative of the Roma group and of the group of the displaced? And what is the relation between Roma and the displaced? Or, moreover, what qualifies the smoking man to stand for a collective identity? Beyond the ethnic and situational markers of the character, there is also a hint at the idea of risk that the *smoking Roma* also embodies. The risk in the image could be represented by old age, smoking habits, homelessness, but it could also be interpreted that being Roma is a risky identity or, in the same vein, Roma identity is a possible societal risk (just like passive smoking is a risk for non-smokers).

The photograph is a point of view in itself. One can say that the photo is pleasant and rather resembles a fine art photo because the character is very expressive and gives authenticity to the image. But if the photo is seen as an art photo, what is the reason for placing it in a policy research document?

The photo can be interpreted in two registers. The obvious *punctum* (Barthes 1980) is represented by the waves of smoke surrounding the man. These waves of smoke are the place where the gazes of the character and the observer intersect. The act of smoking supposedly associated with Roma identity sends the observer the following (meta-) messages: (1) the freedom associated with the act of smoking, hence the

bohemian character of the personage and, by extension, of the group he represents; and (2) the unhealthy habit of smoking suggests the self-inflicted risks on the individual, but also on the Roma group.

The uniqueness of the photograph consists of its ability to capture the very moment when the character is smoking. But the uniqueness of the photograph is not necessary related to the topic it intends to represent. Without knowing the context given by the title of the report, the identity of the organization publishing it, and the text that follows the picture, one may believe that the character is advertising cigarettes, or perhaps the de-contextualized reading of the photo could make one think that he/she may find a tobacco (or anti-tobacco) campaign in the text of the report. For a reader who is unfamiliar with policy research and UNDP work, there are two main quick readings of the photo which come to mind: on the one hand, the *romanticism* attributed to Roma as a key to reading the image and, on the other hand, the *moralism* resulting from giving prominence to a behavior deemed inappropriate, such as smoking. Associations between the smoking behavior and Roma ethnicity are not new, but are classic examples of images which became stereotypes in art, literature, and marketing (e.g., Édouard Manet's "Gypsy with Cigarette" or "Gitanes" posters advertising the tobacco industry in France). Instead, in a policy report, linking the image of Roma and the romantic stereotypes around a Gypsy smoker is of questionable appropriateness.

Thus, what remains in the memory of the viewer after a quick look at the photo is the very act of smoking of the character. Asked to give a title to the photo, one would probably find, as I also found, that the title "Smoking Gypsy" fully describes the photo. The character fulfills the stereotypical image about Roma as smokers. The photo authenticates (through the power embodied by the institution, the UNDP in this case) that Roma are smokers and this *authentication* is given by the naturalness but also by the artfulness of the photograph that has been selected for the cover. UNDP visual policy in regard to representation of Roma is also reflected in a photographic portfolio that describes smoking or half-naked children.⁹

⁹ See, for example, the cover of the UNDP (2005) report, or for inside text photos, see the UNDP (2006b).

3. THE UNTOLD ROMA STORY OR THE REPRESSED NORMALCY

Questions to ask are the following: What are the functions of photography in publications about Roma? What is the image constructed to represent the Roma group, transmitted to the public (intentionally or not) through the photos from these publications? Most of the photographic representations of Roma used for illustrating various products of policy analysis are *stereotypical examples* that portray a predominately negative image of Roma. This does not mean that all of the policy analysis reports that use photos of Roma are circumscribed to a negative representation, as there are also exceptions when the photos are adequately fitting the content and do not transmit a stereotyped vision of Roma (e.g., Equality UK and REF 2011). However, the widespread mode of representing Roma in policy analysis is through images that conform to the well- and long-established negative stereotypes of Roma; due to the scarcity of exceptions, these positive representations are just reinforcing the negative perceptual trend. Moreover, when sometimes positive depictions of Roma appear in policy documents, these images portray Roma people themselves working on projects or in programs that target Roma, suggesting that professional success among Roma is to be found in this niche occupational field rather than in mainstream professions.

The use of photography in policy research documents reveals an implicit perspective on Roma identity: an essentialist identity in which the presented circumstances of a particular person stand not merely as descriptors of an individual identity, but by extension also as representation of a typified Roma group. The meaning that the photographs convey in these documents contradicts the explicit definitions of Roma that appear in the written text (when such definitions are provided), definitions that advance Roma as a diverse group, including their social status. In contrast to the proposed diversity of the group provided in some textual accounts, visual depictions in the policy documents are reductionist. The photographic depiction of Roma in policy literature has a tendency to highlight the negative characteristics prevailing in the common perception, which in turn reinforces the societal stigma of the group. These photographic representations have a powerful role in

confirming the stereotypes held by the majority population in relation to Roma, considering the fact that although the readers of policy documents are a rather restricted audience (academics, politicians, NGO representatives, journalists, etc.) but as opinion leaders they shape public beliefs.

The images circulated in policy papers can play an important role in the sociological and social imagery about Roma. Putting aside the good intentions of the policy documents for the time being, the dissemination of stereotypical representations about Roma, as a perverse effect, can lead to the reproduction of stereotypes and the deepening of exclusionary attitudes of society regarding Roma, contrary to the mission of such organizations that purport to combat Roma exclusion. Despite the differences in organizational missions of the institutions mentioned above, the portfolio of photos used to depict Roma is mostly isomorphic, presenting more similarities than differences. Irrespective of the topics of inquiry, the portrayal of the general Roma image is more or less the same in various policy documents. This similarity in the visual representation of Roma indicates uniformity in the perception of Roma at the level of visual policies, which can be a result of an institutional process of group-thinking in a closed professional community.

The use of isomorphic photographs depicting Roma people extends beyond the sphere of organizations having Roma programs, projects, and policies, and spreads to the portfolio of images used in mass media. Although mass media follows a more sensationalist discursive approach towards Roma, there are still many similarities between these two types of institutions in terms of their visual policy representing the group. Photographic clichés about Roma in journalistic and expert discourse form a common ground for understanding the Roma and fix the public's perception. While mass media has been criticized for its enormous production and dissemination of stereotypes about Roma, a similar criticism in regard to the abundant production of stereotypical images produced and circulated in policy reports about Roma is still missing.

Conducting a visual search for the "authentic Roma" in policy and expert literature, most often one can find the image of the Roma borrowed from the repertoire of mass media: the poor, the uneducated, etc. Following their own organizational logic, international organizations convey policy papers with photographs that make Roma into an

exclusive target group that fits the specifics of each organization: the poor in the case of the World Bank, the underdeveloped communities for the UNDP, the uneducated for the Roma Education Fund, and the deprived child in the case of UNICEF. Many of these targeted depictions of Roma people are realistic descriptions of life circumstances of the people portrayed, but the marginalized and excluded Roma that are presented and represented through photographs in policy literature tell an incomplete story, giving just a partial account of the Roma people. In the construction of Roma identity that policy writings indirectly and yet powerfully contribute to, the positive elements of this identity are most often missing or, at best, marginal. Roma people who built a mainstream successful career despite adversities encountered in the social environment are rarely represented. Also missing from the overall policy picture are those cases of Roma who have left urban or rural ghettos where they were born and are now living integrated in society, filling a myriad of occupations, holding various social positions, living in diverse neighborhoods, etc.

The stigmatizing description of Roma identity, constructed partially through photography, presents a double challenge for policy literature: (1) how to (re)create social ties when such ties are loosened by the exteriorization of Roma as a group living outside of society; and (2) how to attract in an emancipatory project those individuals for which the newly re-created identities (in the context of post-communist Southeastern Europe) appear to be stigmatizing. Vermeersch (2001) considers that mobilization on ethnic grounds is problematic in the case of Roma given the difficulties of mass mobilization around an identity mainly framed in a negative fashion.

The use of photography in scientific and expert publications about Roma also raises some ethical questions and concerns. Photography, alongside quantitative sociological techniques and methods of research, is a tool of objectification of Roma by discarding the process of personal and group development and mobility and retaining the moment through the capture of a finite sequence of reality. Photography in policy research about Roma is also a strategy of identification from the outside, identification whose roots can be found in the early administrative and anthropological practices of identification through physiognomy. A common visual characteristic of photographs in policy research publications about Roma is the identification of the subject by

the phenotype of a darker complexion. In most cases, Roma presented in these photos are Roma with darker skin, although the group is not necessary limited to this characteristic. The public image of Roma is racialized by extensively choosing to represent Roma as people with darker skin.

Another ethical concern is related to the requests for anonymity and confidentiality that any scientific research should guarantee. Although policy research as a scientific practice should respect the deontological concerns mentioned above, by using photographs to accompany policy reports the rules of anonymity and confidentiality are neglected because individuals are given a face making their identification possible. Scientific research has to conform to the request of protecting subjects' personal identity and avoiding their possible identification, which is obviously broken by publishing photos of the people.

Generally, photos used in most of the policy reports describe unsuccessful Roma life stories. Portraying somebody in a negative manner (telling the story of poverty and illiteracy) is authoritatively taking away the opportunity of the portrayed person to tell in prospect or in retrospect a different story. Using photos of children that assign a visually stigmatized identity means using moments from the life of a future adult who cannot control and transform his own life story because this story was previously objectified by powerful actors. The objectification of Roma children in research reports through photography deprives them of agency and freedom to write their own narrative at a later stage, from a different social position, and in full control of the expressive means of making and sharing their own life story. Many of the photos used in policy reports are personal images that one would probably prefer to keep private insofar as in many cases these pictures represent the most despised circumstances in which people were captured by the camera. Goffman (1979) makes a distinction between *private* and *public* pictures and suggests that private pictures that are made public are intruding into privacy by exposing circumstances that individuals will not necessarily give their consent to make public.

By the overwhelming presentation of negative images about Roma, the existing photographic portfolio in policy literature represses a possible alternative story about Roma, a story of social integration and occupational mobility, a story which is after all no less valid than the one currently presented. The photographic portfolios of interna-

tional organizations fail to challenge the widespread stereotypes about Roma and to acknowledge that there are many people who have left the ghetto without external support of NGOs or governments, people who are educated, employed (with the same threat of unemployment as others nowadays) and live in average housing circumstances. What is advisable for organizations putting together policy research about Roma is to change the paradigm from seeing Roma in an essentialist manner and to assume a role and a responsibility for the images circulated in the public sphere. By advancing a standardized image of Roma and presenting the group as radically different from the majority, an image of Roma that promotes similarities with non-Roma is repressed. The missing images of Roma are those depicting normalcy and banality, describing a myriad of people who anonymously perform daily roles and duties outside of the sphere of policy identifications.

The photos chosen to exemplify an image about a particular Roma person or a specific sub-group lead to an oversimplified and one-dimensional vision about the entire Roma population. The photos of Roma in policy papers seem to fall into what Goffman described as *photographic fallacy*: “the very general tendency to confuse realness with representativeness and ideographic with nomothetic validity” (1979, 20). The criticism of the hegemonic imagery of Roma in policy literature is needed in order to open new ways of speaking about and seeing Roma. Deconstructing the essentialism in which Roma are seen today (as well as in the past) is a critical issue not only as an academic endeavor, but it is even more important for policy-making and for those who are labeled as Roma or who self-identify as such.

Conclusions

The narratives about Roma in the last two decades were and continue to be a hot subject: there have been many books, articles, and academic theses written on the matter. The prevailing margins of Roma identity would not exist today without the narratives produced and reproduced by the numerous experts involved in Roma-related issues. Some researchers and institutions, for example, have widely published on Roma poverty while others have recently written on the genetics of Roma. Nevertheless, the systematic study of Roma is much older—methodical surveillance and categorization of Roma by police professionals dates back to the nineteenth century, and genetic interest in Roma in the field of sero-anthropology emerged as early as 1921. Roma have been subjected to a variety of scientific practices, such as counting, classifying, demographic predictions, mapping, photographing, and DNA profiling. Despite the variety of expert classifiers, the production of knowledge about Roma presents a curious consensus on who Roma are, reinforcing stereotypes. Consequently, Roma identity tends to be recognized by the strength of the stereotypes related to it. Scientific and policy practices of Roma classification are part and parcel of a trained vision that itself needs to be observed.¹

¹ This concluding chapter is an extension of my article “Who Defines Roma?” published on the Open Society Foundations blog on May 8, 2014 (<http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/voices/who-defines-roma>).

Many stereotypes are created by out-groups, of which the academic establishment is just one part, and then internalized and reproduced by Roma themselves. Policy analysis chiefly produces and circulates a *standard image* of Roma as a group of marginal and vulnerable people, if not at-risk or welfare-dependent. In doing so, policy analysts and policymakers, as well as academics and journalists, create and maintain negative definitions of Roma. While mass media discourse on Roma was analyzed and criticized for its stereotypes and negative consequences, academic and expert discourse was scrutinized less. Yet, journalistic accounts of Roma do not occur in a vacuum but are assembled in order to fit, sustain, and reinforce a public perception. Many journalists write what the public might find interesting (not to say shocking) and recognizable. Furthermore, articles and media products about Roma rely on what the experts say about the topic; this way, Roma representation has come full circle, where the expertise of larger networks relies on taken-for-granted comprehension of human differences that is legitimated as scientific and expert knowledge. The expertise in “Roma issues” is problematic insofar as it becomes normative, explaining who and how the Roma are, and prescriptive, stating how they should be.

I argued that in order to frame Roma groupness, experts and scientists from diverse epistemic communities (such as police professionals, policy analysts, social scientists, and geneticists) establish fixed characteristics, such as the size of the Roma group and its foreign (Indian) origin. These two elements allow for recognition of the group despite changing labels (from Gypsies to Roma) and assure a continuity of both academic/expert and political discourse. In addition to building on these core elements that allow members of diverse epistemic communities to have a common object of study and intervention, shaping Roma as a coherent group also requires a legitimate status of knowledge producers. This status is based on authority (epistemic, political, or both) and on the solidity of networks, making circulation of Roma-related knowledge possible and efficient. The Indian connection of Roma as well as the estimated size of the Roma group (a number, as I have shown, that is not sustained by sources, but only repeated) over time have become the enduring narratives in a variety of scientific disciplines. The consensus around these two issues is so broad and firm that even merely questioning it becomes difficult;

although the consensus is problematic, especially when the Indian connection is sought in the field of biology, in stories of endogamy and of unchanged (and unchangeable) cultural norms. However, the narrative of the Indian origin of Roma is not without consequences. The discursive deployment of the Indian connection through the many channels used by networks of professionals, gives strength to categorizations of Roma as non-European at a time of resurgent nationalism and identity politics. At the visual level, Roma identity is standardized even more powerfully than in texts: stereotypes are abundant among images of Roma (the beggar, naked children on the garbage dump, the shantytown resident, the displaced, the poor migrant), which narrow public perceptions. While these photographic instances are certainly part of reality, nevertheless, emphasizing only this aspect perpetuates a deeply negative vision of Roma as a group.

As I argue throughout the book, today's discourse on Roma cannot be properly understood without taking a *longue durée* perspective on Roma categorization. The emergence of an oppositional *Roma–non-Roma* identity is better understood if looked at as a process of co-construction. This process must be approached from both sides: on the one hand, institutions and their classification practices, and on the other hand, individuals performing Roma identity in their social relationships. In this regard the historical interplay between the scientific and administrative practices of identification and the way individuals self-ascribe is key for understanding the feedback loop from expert knowledge to people's self-perception. In the case of Roma, agency has been largely placed in the hands of mediators who purported to speak for the group, and in doing so, they firmly constructed the borders of Roma identity and enhanced recognition as well as self-recognition. In this regard, representations of Roma follow the logic of regimes of truth—that is, socio-political constellations that make the stabilization of identities and categories possible. Such regimes of truth, past and present, are those that impinge on the polar categories of Roma and non-Roma.

I agree with those political scientists who assert that often what appear to be “Roma voices” are in fact just institutional views put forward about Roma. Since the platforms to speak about Roma are not neutral grounds for expression, political activists, whether Roma or not, have to comply with institutional interests and with the types of

discourse offered by institutions having a stake in “Roma issues.” It is rather difficult to have independent voices speak to a public—a voice needs a political, civic, or academic platform to be heard and institutional support behind it. It is this institutional support that compels the alignment of voices (including those of a few Roma who work in these institutions) to a uniform view of the Roma group. In other words, in order to have a view about Roma, one has to adopt the institutional perspective and make concessions if his/her views diverge.

The interest in describing and representing Roma is both scientific and political: science presumes to represent Roma as a research object by constituting Roma group identity through its various disciplinary branches, while political entrepreneurs bolster their agendas by instrumentalizing Roma as a political object. Scientific or expert interests are at the same time epistemic and profit-driven, but not for those categorized.

Currently, the narratives about radical differences between Roma and non-Roma prevail over those descriptions, which give a central place to common venues, encounters, and similarities between Roma and others. The homogenous image of Roma presented by researchers is inaccurate because it is incomplete. On the one hand, not all individuals judged by the researchers as Roma think of themselves as such. On the other hand, the problems that are believed to apply exclusively to Roma are not relevant to all of them, but also applicable to many non-Roma. Perhaps the best way to understand the “Roma issue” is not to analyze the Roma (as ethnic identity is contextual and fluid) but to look at their various classifiers and modes of objectification. The scientific and expert “truth” established by Roma-related research is one that is conjectural, interested, and highly dependent on the political regimes in power. The way in which experts classify people (including Roma) can have important consequences for those who are classified. The expert and scientific images of Roma contribute to exacerbating the existing social divisions by lending academic credibility to incorrect and dangerous perceptions that Roma are somehow fundamentally different from everyone else. Cutting Roma out from the social ensemble and fashioning them as an epistemic object and a policy target by scientists and experts has had dreadful consequences for those categorized as being apart. Whether these cut-out Roma served scholars in describing “gaps” in education, health, and employment, or they served

organizations such as the World Bank or UNDP to advance new policy agendas (to name only two of the most benign streams of depictions), they all tend to sketch Roma portraits of radical otherness, social failure, marginality, vulnerability, and deviance. These hardly sympathetic portrayals have the effect of dislocating people who were classified as Gypsies or Roma from the social structure and positioning them as an ethnic group of outsiders to all European societies, where, in fact, they belong. The long history of the obsession with the quantification of difference enacted by experts, from policemen to policy researchers, affected social solidarity since Roma were presented as a “foreign” element of society in terms of their values, behavior, allegiance, and loyalty. In this regard, people, who previously interacted as neighbors, started to appraise their communities in terms prescribed by experts—Roma and non-Roma. This was helped by the myriad of Roma-targeted projects, in which Roma were selected from wider neighborhoods and subjected to projects that were supposed to be to their benefit. The same pattern of dislocation applies in other social contexts of interaction, when suddenly Roma became different, alongside political and expert-technical discourse and intervention: in the labor market they are now employed or unemployed Roma, in schools they achieved the attribute of Roma as more important than simply pupils, in public hospitals they became “Roma patients,” or in matters of democratic participation they are seen as “Roma citizens” or “citizens of Roma origin.” It seems that such a split of Roma and non-Roma in matters of social policies and citizenship encouraged a doubling of organizational structures (auto-)invested with policy competencies, but without doubling the benefits for those labeled as Roma, or for society as a whole. Paradoxically, approaches that at least in their intent seek to “empower” those defined as Roma to perform in organizational and social roles, leave Roma without their fundamental social and citizenship attributes by focusing on ethnic aspects, frequently with racial implications. Perhaps more importantly, the presentation of Roma as vulnerable victims and as marginal people, if not deviant, is affecting many who are so labeled, requiring them to adapt their aspirations to the narrow horizons prescribed by these descriptions.

My argument is that a new research agenda is needed if stereotypes addressing Roma are to be considered seriously—the negative image of Roma has to be analyzed, challenged, and deconstructed in

its production sites, whether those are academic, political, or journalistic. It is time for experts to show more prudence in their assumptions, descriptions, and methodologies, and to begin depoliticizing Roma ethnicity. I hope that my book made a step in this direction by showing how scientific and expert descriptions of Roma are made, explaining how narrow frames of evaluating Roma groupness emerged, revealing the biases contained in basic assumptions, and examining concepts and methodologies of framing Roma. I also hope I illustrated the reasons why these expert-political constructions are so dangerous and detrimental to those labeled, and how alternative and more accurate presentations of Roma could bring more favorable outcomes. The commonplace depiction of Roma as a poor, uneducated, welfare-dependent, or vulnerable population resulted in policy consequences such as increased surveillance, ethnic profiling, and cuts in basic forms of social welfare, and led to the management of the poor by communities of experts. From this standpoint, the view that the term Roma applies to a broad range of culturally diverse sub-groups, who are in fact more similar with the majority population of their respective places of residence than to a transnational Roma category, should be revisited. There are many alternative ways of conceptualizing Roma that may produce benefits for the group homogeneously described as such. Certainly, the constructive way forward is not a direction that showcases (a few) Roma working themselves in “Roma issues” as socially successful people; unfortunately, such a trend is already underway.

The alternative view that I advance aims rather to change and challenge both the placement of Roma in the position of victims and their alleged social threat due to criminality or disease. The basic premise of such an alternative view is the following: social policies in any of the matters regarding education, health, or employment should build on universalist principles and involve all persons affected by negative social-systemic outcomes, irrespective of their ethno-cultural allegiances or their so-called Roma origin. At any rate, it is impossible to determine origin with objectivity (without falling into the trap of racist biologization and recognition of body differences or differences in genetic makeup), just as it is also impossible to qualify that a so-called non-Roma individual has nothing in common with a Roma. As such, the attribute of being Roma cannot stand as a premise for developing and implementing *social* policies at national and European levels.

It does not mean that Roma should be discursively cut out from European societies for their own good, as it happens in current neo-liberal policy regimes, but social policies should be decoupled from an ethnic base and must be rethought as policies for all. The political regimes that make us all (not only Roma) much poorer, uneducated, unemployed, and vulnerable should be reconsidered and changed. Universalist principles for social policies will lead to the recovery of social solidarity and civic activism, aspects that have been lost during the last two decades. This alternative view and policy approach will switch the emphasis from Roma as “Others” to Roma as citizens and neighbors.

Bibliography

- About, Ilse. 2012. "Underclass Gypsies: An Historical Approach on Categorization and Exclusion in France in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries." In *The Gypsy 'Menace': Populism and the New Anti-Gypsy Politics*, edited by Michael Stewart, 95–117. London: C. Hurst & Co.
- Abu El-Haj, Nadia. 2012. *The Genealogical Science: The Search for Jewish Origins and the Politics of Epistemology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Achim, Venera. 2005. "Statistica țiganilor în Principatele Române în perioada 1830–1860" [The statistics of Gypsies in the Romanian principalities in the period 1830–1860]. *Revista istorică* 16 (3–4): 97–122.
- Achim, Venera, and Raluca Tomi. 2010. *Documente de arhivă privind robia țiganilor: epoca dezrobirii* [Archive documents regarding Gypsy slavery: The age of emancipation]. București: Editura Academiei Române.
- Achim, Viorel. 2001. "The Romanian Population Exchange Project Elaborated by Sabin Manuila in October 1941." *Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento/Jahrbuch des italienisch-deutschen Instituts in Trient* 27: 593–617.
- . 2004. *The Roma in Romanian History*. Budapest: Central University Press.
- . 2005. "Romanian-German Collaboration in Ethnopolitics: The Case of Sabin Manuila." In *German Scholars and Ethnic Cleansing, 1919–1945*, edited by Ingo Haar and Michael Fahlbusch, 139–154. New York: Berghahn Books.
- . 2007. "Gypsy Research and Gypsy Policy in Romania, 1920–1950." In *Zwischen Erziehung und Vernichtung*, edited by Michael Zimmermann, 157–174. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Acton, Thomas. 2006. "Romani Politics, Scholarship, and the Discourse of Nation-Building." In *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities: Contextual, Con-*

- structed and Contested, edited by Adrian Marsh and Elin Strand, 27–37. Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute.
- Agger, Ben. 1991. "Critical Theory, Poststructuralism, Postmodernism: Their Sociological Relevance." *Annual Review of Sociology* 17: 105–131.
- Ahmed, Patricia, Cynthia Feliciano, and Rebecca J. Emigh. 2007. "Internal and External Ethnic Assessments in Eastern Europe." *Social Forces* 86 (1): 231–255.
- Aly, Götz, and Karl H. Roth. 2004. *The Nazi Census: Identification and Control in the Third Reich*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. (1983) 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London, NY: Verso.
- Aspinal, J. Peter. 2009. "The Future of Ethnicity Classifications." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (9): 1417–1435.
- Azmanov, N. Dimitar, Sashka Zhelyazkova, Dimova, Petya S., et al. 2010. "Mosaicism of a missense SCN1A mutation and Dravet syndrome in a Roma/Gypsy family." *Epileptic Disorders* 12 (2): 117–124.
- van Baar, Huub. 2009. "Contesting Neo-liberal Practices in Central and Eastern Europe: Romani Minority Governance Between Activation and Activism." http://www.researchgate.net/publication/228894746_Contesting_Neo-liberal_Practices_in_Central_and_Eastern_Europe_Romani_Minority_Governance_Between_Activation_and_Activism.
- Bakker, Peter, and Yaron Matras. 1997. "Introduction." In *The Typology and Dialectology of Romani*, edited by Peter Bakker, Yaron Matras, and Khristo Kyuchukov, vii–xxx. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Balibar, Étienne. (1991) 1996. "Fictive Ethnicity and Ideal Nation." In *Ethnicity*, edited by John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, 164–168. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2009. "Foreword." In *Romani Politics in Contemporary Europe: Poverty Ethnic Mobilization, and the Neoliberal Order*, edited by Nando Sigona and Nidhi Trehan. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2011. "Racisme et politique communautaire: les Roms." *Lignes*, no. 34: 135–144.
- Banton, Michael. 2007. "Max Weber on 'ethnic communities': a critique." *Nations and Nationalism* 13 (1): 19–35.
- Barth, Fredrik. 1969. "Introduction." In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, edited by Fredrik Barth, 9–38. Bergen/Boston: Universitetsforlaget/Little Brown & Co.
- Barthes, Roland. 1980. "Rhetoric of the Image." In *Classics Essays on Photography*, edited by Alan Trachtenberg, 269–285. New Haven, CT: Leete's Island Books.
- . 1984. *Camera lucida: Reflections on photography*. London: Flamingo.
- Bárány, Zoltán. 2001. *The East European Gypsies: Regime Change, Marginality, and Ethnopolitics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beck, Sam. 1989. "The origins of Gypsy slavery in Romania." *Dialectical Anthropology* 14 (1): 53–61.

- Berescu, Cătălin. 2013. "On Some Ethnic Housing Areas of Călărași." *Studia UBB Sociologia* 58 (2): 77–110.
- Berger, L. Peter, and Thomas Luckmann. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Best, Joel. 2001. *Damned Lies and Statistics: Untangling Numbers from the Media, Politicians, and Activists*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Boswell, Christina. 2009. *The Political Uses of Expert Knowledge: Immigration Policy and Social Research*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Boudon, Raymond. 1974. *Education, Opportunity, and Social Inequality: Changing Prospects in Western Society*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1972. "Public Opinion Does Not Exist." In *Communication and Class Struggle*, edited by Armand Mattelart and Seth Siegelau. New York: Bagnolet: International General, International Mass Media Research Center.
- . 1975. "The specificity of the scientific field and the social conditions of the progress of reason." *Social Science Information* 14 (6): 19–47.
- . 1988. "Vive la crise! For heterodoxy in social science." *Theory and Society* 17 (5): 773–787.
- . 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loïc Wacquant. 1999. "On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason." *Theory, Culture & Society* 16 (1): 41–58.
- . 2001. "NewLiberalSpeak: Notes on the New Planetary Vulgate." *Radical Philosophy* 105: 1–5.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, Luc Boltanski, Robert Castel, Jean-Claude Chamboredon, and Dominique Schnapper. 1990. *Photography: A Middle-Brow Art*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bowker, C. Geoffrey, and Susan L. Star. 2002. *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. 1977. *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Breen, Richard, and John H. Goldthorpe. 2001. "Classes sociales, mobilité et mérite: l'expérience de deux cohortes britanniques." In *Ecole et société: Les paradoxes de la démocratie*, edited by Raymond Boudon, Nathalie Bulle, and Mohamed Cherkaoui, 207–240. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 2004. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers, Mara Loveman, and Peter Stamatov. 2004. "Ethnicity as cognition." *Theory and Society* 33 (1): 31–64.
- Bucur, Maria. 2002. *Eugenics and Modernization in Interwar Romania*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Burke, Peter. 1992. *History and Social Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- . 2012. *A Social History of Knowledge II. From the Encyclopédie to Wikipedia*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- . 2013. *Cultural Hybridity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Burleigh, Michael, and Wolfgang Wippermann. 1991. *The Racial State: Germany 1933–1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Callon, Michel. 1986. “Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St Brieuc Bay.” In *Power, Action, and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?*, edited by John Law, 196–223. London: Routledge.
- Chelcea, Ion. 1944. *Țigani din România. Monografie etnografică* [Gypsies from Romania: An ethnographic monograph]. București: Editura Institutului Central de Statistică.
- Cicourel, Aaron V. 1982. “Interviews, Surveys, and the Problem of Ecological Validity.” *The American Sociologist* 17 (1): 11–20.
- Cozmei, Victor. 2013. *Marea anomalie a recensământului: ‘Indisponibili’ au batut la numar etnicii maghiari si romi. Peste 1,2 milioane de persoane nu si-au declarat etnia in 2011, iar numarul oficial al romilor este de doar 621.000* [The great anomaly of the census: ‘The Unavailable’ numerically surpassed Hungarians and Roma. More than 1.2 million people have not declared their ethnicity in 2011 and the official number of Roma is just 621,000]. July 10. <http://www.hotnews.ro/stiri-esential-15161665-tablou-interactiv-mareaanomalie-recensamantului-indisponibili-batut-numar-etnicii-maghiari-romipeste-1-2-milioane-persoane-nu-declarat-etnia-2011-iar-numarul-oficialromilor-este-doar-621-000.htm?nomobile> (accessed September 10, 2013).
- Crowe, David. 1994. *A History of the Gypsies of Eastern Europe and Russia*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Deacon, Bob. 2000. “Eastern European welfare states: The impact of the politics of globalization.” *Journal of European Social Policy* 10 (2): 146–161.
- Deacon, Bob, and Michelle Hulse. 1997. “The Making of Post-Communist Social Policy: The Role of International Agencies.” *Journal of Social Policy* 26 (1): 43–62.
- Donert, Celia. 2008. “The struggle for the soul of the Gypsy’: Marginality and mass mobilization in Stalinist Czechoslovakia.” *Social History* 33 (2): 123–144.
- Epstein, Steven. 2007. *Inclusion: The Politics of Difference in Medical Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Feyerabend, Paul. (1975) 2010. *Against Method*. London, NY: Verso.
- Filhol, Emmanuel. 2007. “La loi de 1912 sur la circulation des ‘nomades’ (Tsiganes) en France.” *Revue européenne des migrations internationales* 23, (2): 2–20.
- Fleck, Ludwik. (1935) 1979. *Genesis and development of a scientific fact*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Földes, M. Éva, and Alina Covaci. 2012. “Research on Roma health and access to healthcare: State of the art and future challenges.” *International Journal of Public Health* 57 (1): 37–39.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984a. “Space, Knowledge and Power.” In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 239–256. New York: Pantheon Books.

-
- . 1984b. "The Means of Correct Training." In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 188–205. New York: Pantheon Books.
- . 1984c. "Truth and Power." In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 51–75. New York: Pantheon Books.
- . 1984d. "What is an Author?" In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 101–120. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fraser, Angus. 1992. *The Gypsies*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Friedman, Eben. 2013. "Education in Member State Submission under the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies." *European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI)-Working Paper*. http://www.ecmi.de/uploads/tx_lfpubdb/WP_73.pdf.
- Gannett, Lisa. 2001. "Racism and Human Genome Diversity Research: The Ethical Limits of 'Population Thinking.'" *Philosophy of Science* 63 (3): 479–492.
- . 2004. "The Biological Reification of Race." *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 55 (2): 323–345.
- Gannett, Lisa, and James R. Griesemer. 2004. "The ABO Blood Groups: Mapping the History and Geography of Genes in Homo Sapiens." In *Classical Genetic Research and its Legacy: Mapping Cultures of Twentieth-Century Genetics*, edited by Hans-Jörg Rheinberger and Jean-Paul Gaudillière, 119–172. New York: Routledge.
- Gay y Blasco, Paloma. 2001. "We Don't Know Our Descent': How the Gitanos of Jarana Manage the Past." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 7 (4): 631–647.
- . 2008. "Picturing 'Gypsies': Interdisciplinary Approaches to Roma Representation." *Third Text* 22 (3): 297–303.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Georgescu, D.C. 1936. "Secția de Demografie, Antropologie și Eugenie a Institutului Social Român" [The Department of Demography, Anthropology and Eugenics of the Romanian Social Institute]. *Sociologie Românească* 1 (12): 56–57.
- Gheorghe, Nicolae. 1983. "The origin of Roma's slavery in the Romanian principalities." *Roma* 7 (1): 12–27.
- . 1997. "The social construction of Romani identity." In *Gypsy Politics and Traveler Identity*, edited by Thomas Acton, 153–171. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- . 2013. "Choices to be made and prices to be paid: Potential roles and consequences in Roma activism and policy-making." In *From Victimhood to Citizenship: The Path of Roma Integration*, edited by Will Guy, 41–100. Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó.
- Giurescu, Constantin. 1943. *Studii de istorie socială* [Studies of Social History]. București: Editura "Universul" S.A.
- Goffman, Erving. (1963) 1986. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- . (1974) 1986. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

- . (1976) 1979. *Gender Advertisements*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper & Row.
- Goldscheider, Calvin. 2002. "Ethnic categorization in censuses: Comparative observations from Israel, Canada and the United States." In *Census and Identity: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Language in National Censuses*, edited by David I. Kertzer and Dominique Arel, 71–92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, Colin. 1991. "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 1–52. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gould, Stephen Jay. 1996. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Greenberg, Jack. 2010. "Report on Roma education today: From slavery to segregation and beyond." *Columbia Law Review* 110 (4): 919–1001.
- Grellmann, Heinrich Moritz Gottlieb. 1787. *Dissertation on the Gipsies: Being an Historical Enquiry, Concerning the Manner of Life, Family Economy, Customs and Conditions of These People in Europe, and Their Origin*. London.
- Gresham, David, Bharti Morar, Peter A. Underhill, et al. 2001. "Origins and Divergence of the Roma (Gypsies)." *The American Journal of Human Genetics* 69 (6): 1314–1331.
- Guy, Will. 2001. "Romani Identity and Post-Communist Policy." In *Between Past and Future: The Roma of Central and Eastern Europe*, edited by Will Guy, 3–32. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Haas, M. Peter. 1992. "Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46 (1): 1–35.
- Hacking, Ian. 1983. *Representing and Intervening: Introductory Topics in the Philosophy of Natural Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1986. "Making up People." In *Reconstructing Individualism: Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*, edited by Thomas C. Heller, Morton Sosna, and David E. Wellbery, 222–236. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 1991. "How should we do the history of statistics?" In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 181–197. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- . 1995. "The Looping Effects of Human Kinds." In *Causal Cognition: A Multidisciplinary Debate*, edited by Dan Sperber, David Premack, and Ann J. Premack, 351–394. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1999. *The Social Construction of What?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hajioff, Steve, and Martin McKee. 2000. "The health of the Roma people: A review of the published literature." *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 54 (11): 864–869.
- Hancock, Ian. 1987. *The Pariah Syndrome: An Account of Gypsy Slavery and Persecution*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

- . 2000. "The Emergence of Romani as a Koiné Outside of India." In *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle: Commitment in Romani Studies*, edited by Thomas Acton, 1–13. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Hunter, Michael, Evelyn Heyer, Frederic Austerlitz, et al. 2002. "The P28T Mutation in the GALK1 Gene Accounts for Galactokinase Deficiency in Roma (Gypsy) Patients across Europe." *Pediatric Research* 51: 602–606.
- Jencks, Christopher, Marshall Smith, Henry Acland, Mary Jo Bane, et al. 1972. *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jenkins, Richard. 1996. *Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
- . 1997. *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Joseph, M. Anne. 2001. "Anthropometry, the Police Expert, and the Deptford Murders: The Contested Introduction of Fingerprinting for the Identification of Criminals in Late Victorian and Edwardian Britain." In *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*, edited by Jane Caplan and John Torpey, 164–183. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky. 2000. "Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases." In *Judgment and Decision Making: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, edited by Terry Connolly, Hal R. Arkes, and Kenneth R. Hammond, 35–53. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. *Choices, Values, and Frames*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kalaydjieva, Luba, Anna Perez-Lezaun, Dora Angelicheva, et al. 1999. "A Founder Mutation in the GK1 Gene Is Responsible for Galactokinase Deficiency in Roma (Gypsies)." *American Journal of Human Genetics* 65 (5): 1299–1307.
- Kalaydjieva, Luba, Bharti Morar, Raphaele Chaix, and Hua Tang. 2005. "A newly discovered founder population: the Roma/Gypsies." *BioEssays* 27 (10): 1084–1094.
- Kalaydjieva, Luba, David Gresham, and Francesco Calafell. 2001. "Genetic studies of the Roma (Gypsies): A review." *BMC Medical Genetics* 2 (5).
- Kaluszynski, Martine. 2001. "Republican Identity: Bertillonage as Government Technique." In *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*, edited by Jane Caplan and John Torpey, 123–138. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2009. "The International Congress of Criminal Anthropology: Shaping the French and International Criminological Movement, 1886–1914." In *Criminals and their Scientists: The History of Criminology in International Perspective*, edited by P. Becker and R. F. Wetzell, 301–317. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kertzer, David, and Dominique Arel. 2002. "Censuses, identity formation and the struggle for political power." In *Census and Identity: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Language in National Censuses*, 1–43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kitsuse, John I., and Aaron V. Cicourel. 1963. "A Note of the Uses of Official Statistics." *Social Problems* 11 (2): 131–139.
- Kligman, Gail. 2001. "On the Social Construction of 'Otherness': Identifying 'The Roma' in Post-Socialist Communities." *Review of Sociology* 7 (2): 61–78.
- Klimová-Alexander, Ilona. 2005. *The Romani Voice in World Politics: The United Nations and Non-State Actors*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Knorr-Cetina, Karin. 1983. "The ethnographic study of scientific work: Towards a constructivist interpretation of science." In *Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Study of Science*, edited by Karin Knorr-Cetina and Michael Mulkay, 115–140. London: Sage Publications.
- . 1991. "Epistemic Cultures: Forms of Reason in Science." *History of Political Economy* 23 (1): 105–122.
- Kovats, Martin. 2001. "The emergence of European Roma policy." In *Between Past and Future: The Roma of Central and Eastern Europe*, edited by Will Guy, 93–116. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- . 2002. "The European Roma Question." *The Royal Institute of International Affairs* Briefing Paper 31 (March): 1–5.
- . 2003. "The politics of Roma identity: between nationalism and destitution." *Open Democracy*. July 30. http://www.opendemocracy.net/people/migration/europe/article_1399.jsp.
- . 2013. "Integration and the Politicisation of Roma Identity." In *From Victimhood to Citizenship: The Path of Roma Integration*, edited by Will Guy, 101–128. Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó.
- Kóczé, Angéla, and Raluca Popa. 2009. *Missing Intersectionality: Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Class in Current Research and Policies on Romani Women in Europe*. Budapest: Center for Policy Studies, Central European University.
- Lăcătuș, George. 2010. "Cum au pierdut țiganii de mătase banii de integrare" [How the Silk Gypsies lost the money for integration]. *România Liberă*. August 25. <http://www.romanialibera.ro/special/reportaje/cum-au-pierdut-tiganiide-matase-banii-de-integrare-197532> (accessed September 10, 2013).
- Labbé, Morgane. 2009a. "Internationalisme statistique et recensement de la nationalité au XIXe siècle." *Courrier des statistiques* 127: 39–45.
- . 2009b. "Statistique ethnique, légitimité politique et changement de régime." *Critique internationale*, no. 45: 9–18.
- Ladányi, János, and Iván Szelényi. 2001. "The social construction of Roma ethnicity in Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary during market transition." *Review of Sociology* 7 (2): 79–89.
- Latour, Bruno. 1986. "Visualization and Cognition: Thinking with Eyes and Hands." *Knowledge and Society: Studies in the Sociology of Culture Past and Present* 6: 1–40.
- . 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2005. *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

-
- . 2011. "From Multiculturalism to Multinaturalism: What Rules of Method for the New Socio-Scientific Experiments?" *Nature and Culture* 6 (1): 1–17.
- Latour, Bruno, and Steve Woolgar. 1986. *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lee, Sharon M. 1993. "Racial classifications in the US Census: 1890–1990." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16 (1): 75–94.
- Lewontin, Richard. 1972. "The apportionment of Human Diversity." *Evolutionary Biology* 6: 381–398.
- . 2000. *It Ain't Necessarily So: The Dream of the Human Genome and Other Illusions*. Londond: Granta Books.
- Liègeois, Jean-Pierre. (1983) 1986. *Gypsies: An Illustrated History*. London: Al Saqi Books.
- . 1994. *Roma, Tsiganes, Voyageurs*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.
- . 2007. *Roma in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Liègeois, Jean-Pierre, and Nicolae Gheorghe. 1995. *Roma/Gypsies: A European Minority*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Lipphardt, Veronika. 2012. "Isolates and Crosses in Human Population Genetics; or, A Contextualization of German Race Science." *Current Anthropology* 53 (S5): 69–82.
- . 2014. "'Geographical Distribution Patterns of Various Genes': Genetic Studies of Human Variation after 1945." *Studies in History and Philosophy of the Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 47: 50–61.
- Lipphardt, Veronika, and Jorg Niewöhner. 2007. "Producing Difference in an Age of Biosociality. Biohistorical Narratives, Standardisation and Resistance as Translations." *Science, Technology & Innovation Studies* 3 (1): 45–65.
- Lucassen, Leo. 1991. "The Power of Definition, Stigmatisation, Minoritisation, and Ethnicity Illustrated by the History of the Gypsies in the Netherlands." *The Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences* 27: 80–91.
- . 1998. "'Harmful Tramps': Police Professionalization and Gypsies in Germany, 1700–1945." In *Gypsies and Other Itinerant Groups: A Socio-Historical Approach*, edited by Leo Lucassen, Wim Willems, and Anne-Marie Cottaar, 74–93. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Lucassen, Leo, Willems, Wim, and Anne-Marie Cottaar, eds. 1998. *Gypsies and Other Itinerant Groups: A Socio-Historical Approach*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Luebke, David M., and Sybil Milton. 1994. "Locating the Victim: An Overview of Census-Taking, Tabulation Technology, and Persecution in Nazi Germany." *IEEE Annals of the History of Computing* 16 (3): 25–39.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 1998. *Observations on Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. (1979) 1992. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mărginean, Ioan, ed. 2001. *Cercetări cu privire la minoritatea Roma* [Research regarding the Roma minority]. București: Institutul de Cercetare a Calității Vieții.

- Müller-Hill, Benno. 1988. *Murderous Science: Elimination by Scientific Selection of Jews, Gypsies, and Others, Germany 1933–1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Malyarchuk, B. A., M. A. Perkova, M. V. Derenko, T. Vanecek, J. Lazur, and P. Gomolcak. 2008. "Mitochondrial DNA Variability in Slovaks, with Application to the Roma Origin." *Annals of Human Genetics* 72 (2): 228–240.
- Manuilă, Sabin. 1931. *Populațiunea actuală a României. Cifrele preliminare ale recensământului general dela 29 decembrie 1930* [The current population of Romania: Preliminary data from the general census of December 29, 1930]. București: Publicațiile Direcțiunei Recensământului General al Populațiunei.
- . 1941. "Acțiunea biopolitică ca factor de politică de populație" [Biopolitical action as a factor of population politics]. *Buletin Eugenic și Biopolitic* 12: 1–4.
- Marsh, Adrian. 2007. "Research and the Many Representations of Romany Identity." *European Roma Rights Centre*. November 20. <http://www.errc.org/article/research-and-the-many-representations-of-romani-identity/2900>.
- Marushiakova, Elena, and Veselin Popov. 1997. *Gypsies (Roma) in Bulgaria*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- . 2001a. *Gypsies in the Ottoman Empire: A Contribution to the History of the Balkans*. Hatfield: University Hertfordshire Press.
- . 2001b. "Historical and Ethnographic Background: Gypsies, Roma, Sinti." In *Between Past and Future: The Roma of Central and Eastern Europe*, edited by Will Guy, 33–53. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- . 2009. "Gypsy Slavery in Wallachia and Moldavia." In *Nationalisms Today*, edited by Tomasz Kamusella and Krzysztof Jaskułowski, 89–124. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- . 2011. "Between Exoticization and Marginalization. Current Problems of Gypsy Studies." *Behemoth: A Journal on Civilisation* 4 (1): 51–68.
- Matras, Yaron. 2002. *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2014. *Interventions to support Europe's Roma populations risk creating new forms of segregation*. December 1. <http://bit.ly/1pDr1JC>.
- Mayall, David. 2004. *Gypsy Identities 1500–2000: From Egipcians and Moon-men to the Ethnic Romany*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Mendizabal, Isabel, Cristina Valente, Alfredo Gusmão, et al. 2011. "Reconstructing the Indian Origin and Dispersal of the European Roma: A Maternal Genetic Perspective." *PLOS ONE* 6 (1): 1–10.
- Mendizabal, Isabell, Oscar Lao, Urko M. Marigorta, et al. 2012. "Reconstructing the Population History of European Romani from Genome-wide Data." *Current Biology* 22 (24): 2342–2349.
- Milcher, Susanne, and Manfred M. Fischer. 2011. "On labour market discrimination against Roma in South East Europe." *Papers in Regional Science* 90 (4): 773–788.
- Mills, C. Wright. (1959), 2000. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- . 1963. "The cultural apparatus." In *Power, Politics, and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills*, edited by Irving Louis Horowitz, 405–422. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Mina, Minovici. 1896. *Raport asupra congresului de antropologie criminală ținut la Geneva în 1896* [Report on Criminal Anthropology Congress held in Geneva in 1896]. București: Imprimeria Statului.
- Morar, Bharti, David Gresham, Dora Angelicheva, et al. 2004. "Mutation History of the Roma/Gypsies." *The American Journal of Human Genetics* 75 (4): 596–609.
- Mróz, Lech. 2015. *Roma-Gypsy Presence in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, 15th–18th Centuries*. Budapest–New York: Central European University Press.
- Nash, Roy. 2003. "Inequality/Difference in New Zealand education: Social reproduction and the cognitive habitus." *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 13 (2): 171–194.
- Nastasă, Lucian, and Andrea Varga. 2001. *Minorități etnoculturale. Mărturii documentare. Țiganii din România (1919–1945)*. [Ethnocultural minorities: Documentary testimonies; Gypsies from Romania (1919–1945)]. Cluj-Napoca: Fundația CRDE.
- Nobles, Melissa. 2002. "Racial categorization and censuses." In *Census and Identity: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity and Language in National Censuses*, edited by I. David Kertzer and Dominique Arel, 43–71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Okely, Judith. 1983. *The Traveller-Gypsies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parfitt, Tudor, and Yulia Egorova. 2006. *Genetics, Mass Media and Identity: A Case Study of the Genetic Research on the Lemba and Bene-Israel*. London: Routledge.
- Pasquino, Pasquale. 1991. "Theatrum Politicum: the Genealogy of Capital – Police and the State of Prosperity." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 105–118. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Plous, Scott. 2003. "The psychology of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination: An overview." In *Understanding Prejudice and Discrimination*, edited by Scott Plous, 3–48. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Possamai, Adam. 2007. "Yoda Goes to the Vatican: Youth Spirituality and Popular Culture." *Charles Strong Lecture. The Charles Strong Memorial Trust*. http://users.esc.net.au/~nhabel/lectures/Yoda_Goes_to_the_Vatican.pdf.
- Potra, George. (1939), 2001. *Contribuțiuni la istoricul Țiganilor din România* [Contributions to the history of Gypsies in Romania]. București: Curtea Veche.
- Prieto-Flores, Oscar, Lidia Puigvert, and Inaki Santa Kruz. 2012. "Overcoming the odds: Constricted ethnicity in middle-class Roma." *Identities: Global studies in Culture and Power* 19 (2): 191–209.
- Rabinow, Paul. 1996. *Essays on the Anthropology of Reason*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

- Rat, Cristina. 2005. "Romanian Roma, State Transfers, and Poverty. A Study of Relative Disadvantage." *International Journal of Sociology* 35 (3): 85–116.
- Reardon, Jenny. 2005. *Race to the Finish: Identity and Governance in an Age of Genomics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rishi, Weer Rajendra. 1976. *Roma: The Panjabi emigrants in Europe, central and middle Asia, the USSR, and the Americas*. Patiala: Punjabi University.
- Robbin, Alice. 2000. "Administrative policy as symbol system: Political conflict and the social construction of identity." *Administration and Society* 32 (4): 398–431.
- Ruggiero, Kristin. 2001. "Fingerprinting and the Argentine Plan for Universal Identification in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries." In *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*, edited by Jane Caplan and John Torpey, 184–196. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rughiniş, Cosima. 2004. *Social Housing and Roma Residents in Romania*. Budapest: Central European University, Center of Policy Studies, Open Society Institute.
- . 2011. "Quantitative tales of ethnic differentiation: Measuring and using Roma/Gypsy ethnicity in statistical analyses." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 43 (4): 594–619.
- . 2012. *Măsurarea sociologică. Teorii şi practici ale cuantificării* [Sociological measurement: Theories and practices of quantification]. Iaşi: Polirom.
- Rushton, Philippe J., Jelena Čvorović, and Trudy A. Bons. 2007. "General mental ability in South Asians: Data from three Roma (Gypsy) communities in Serbia." *Intelligence* 35 (1): 1–12.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Sarău, Gheorghe. 1998. *Rromii, India si limba rromani* [Roma, India and the Romani language]. Bucureşti: Kriterion.
- Schmid, Antonia. 2012. "Bridging the Gap: Image, Discourse, and Beyond – Towards a Critical Theory of Visual Representation." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 8 (2): 76–89.
- Seltzer, William. 1998. "Population Statistics, the Holocaust, and the Nuremberg Trials." *Population and Development Review* 24 (3): 511–552.
- Seltzer, William, and Margo Anderson. 1994. "The Dark Side of Numbers: The Role of Population Data Systems in Human Right Abuses." *Social Research* 68 (2): 481–513.
- Sigona, Nando. 2005. "Locating 'The Gypsy Problem.' The Roma in Italy: Stereotyping, Labelling and 'Nomad Camps.'" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31 (4): 741–756.
- Sigona, Nando, and Nidhi Trehan. 2009. "Introduction: Romani Politics in Neoliberal Europe." In *Romani Politics in Contemporary Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Mobilization, and the Neo-liberal Order*, edited by Nando Sigona and Nidhi Trehan, 1–23. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Simhandl, Katrin. 2006. "'Western Gypsies and Travellers'–'Eastern Roma': The creation of political objects by the institutions of the European Union." *Nations and Nationalism* 12 (1): 97–115.

- Simon, Patrick. 2007. "Ethnic" statistics and data protection in the Council of Europe countries: Study Report. Council of Europe.
- Simon, Patrick, and Victor Piché. 2012. "Accounting for ethnic and racial diversity: The challenge of enumeration." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (8): 1357–1365.
- Simonovits, Gabor, and Gabor Kezdi. 2013. "The sorting into ethnic identities: Social status and Roma identification in Hungary." <http://www.mtaki.hu/file/download/korosi/2013/simonov.pdf> (accessed December 12, 2013).
- Sommer, Marianne. 2010. "DNA and cultures of remembrance: Anthropological genetics, biohistories and biosocialities." *BioSocieties* 5 (3): 366–390.
- Stewart, Michael. 1997. *The Time of the Gypsies*. Oxford: Westview Press.
- . 2013. "Roma and Gypsy 'Ethnicity' as a Subject of Anthropological Inquiry." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42: 415–432.
- Surdu, Laura, and Mihai Surdu. 2006. *Broadening the Agenda: The Status of Romani Women in Romania*. Budapest: Open Society Institute.
- Surdu, Mihai. 2002. "The Quality of Education in Romanian Schools with High Percentages of Romani Pupils." *Roma Rights: The Quarterly Journal of the European Roma Rights Centre*, nos. 3–4: 9–18. <http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1628>
- Surdu, Mihai, and Eben Friedman. 2013. "The Roma Education Fund—Developments and prospects for Roma inclusion." In *Die Bildungssituation von Sinti und Roma in Europa*, edited by Sabine Hornberg and Christian Brüggemann, 35–53. Münster: Waxmann Verlag.
- Tagg, John. 1993. *The Burden of Representation: Essays on Photographies and Histories*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Templer, Bill. 2006. "Neoliberal Strategies to Defuse a Powder Keg in Europe: the 'Decade of Roma Inclusion' and its Rationale." *New Politics* 10 (4): 137. <http://newpol.org/content/neoliberal-strategies-defuse-powder-keg-europedecade-roma-inclusion-and-its-rationale>.
- Turda, Marius. 2009. "'To End the Degeneration of a Nation': Debates on Eugenic Sterilization in Inter-war Romania." *Medical History* 53 (1): 77–104.
- Vermeersch, Peter. 2005. "Marginality, Advocacy, and the Ambiguities of Multiculturalism: Notes on Romani Activism in Central Europe." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 12 (4): 451–478.
- . 2006. *The Romani Movement: Minority Politics and Ethnic Mobilization in Contemporary Central Europe*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- . 2011. "Roma Identity and Ethnic Mobilisation in Central European Politics." *Paper prepared for the workshop on identity politics ECPR joint sessions in Grenoble*. April 6–11.
- Verzár, Frigyes, and Oszkár Weszeczky. 1921. "Rassenbiologische Untersuchungen mittels Isohämagglutinen." *Biochemische Zeitschrift*, no. 126, 1/4: 33–39.
- Vincze, Enikő. 2006. *Social Exclusion at the Crossroads of Gender, Ethnicity and Class: A View of Romani Women's Reproductive Health*. Budapest: Central European University, Center of Policy Studies, Open Society Institute.

- Vincze, Enikő, and Cristina Raț. 2013. "Spatialization and Racialization of Social Exclusion: The Social and Cultural Formation of 'Gypsy Ghettos' in Romania in a European Context." *Studia UBB Sociologia* 58 (2): 5–21.
- Weber, Max. (1922) 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weiss, F. Sheila. 2006. "Human Genetics and Politics as Mutually Beneficial Resources: The Case of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics During the Third Reich." *Journal of the History of Biology* 39 (1): 41–88.
- . 2012. "The Loyal Genetic Doctor, Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer, and the Institut für Erbbiologie und Rassenhygiene: Origins, Controversy, and Racial Political Practice." *Central European History* 45 (4): 631–668.
- Wetzell, F. Richard. 2000. *Inventing the Criminal: A History of German Criminology, 1880–1945*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Wilde, Oscar. (1888) 1994. *The Happy Prince and Other Stories*. London: Penguin Books.
- Willems, Wim. 1997. *In Search of the True Gypsy: From Enlightenment to Final Solution*. London: Frank Cass.
- Williams, M. Kim. 2005. "Multiracialism & the civil rights future." *Dædalus* 134 (1): 53–60.
- Zoon, Ina. 2001. *On the margins: Roma and public services in Romania, Bulgaria, and Macedonia, with a supplement on housing in the Czech Republic*. New York: Open Society Institute.

Institutional Reports

- ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics). 2001. "The 2001 Census, religion and Jedi." <http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/censushome.nsf/home/2001jedi?opendocument&navpos=320>.
- AGERPRES. 2011. "INS: La recensământul din octombrie, populația romă ar trebui să-și asume apartenența etnică" [At the October census, the Roma population should assume its ethnic affiliation]. July 11. <http://www.agerpres.ro/social/2011/07/11/ins-la-recensamantul-din-octombrie-populatia-roma-ar-trebui-sa-si-asume-apartenenta-etnica-18>.
- Amnesty International. 2013. *Double Standards: Italy's Housing Policies Discriminate Against Roma*. London: Amnesty International Publications.
- CoE (Council of Europe). 2012. "Descriptive Glossary of terms relating to Roma issues." <http://a.cs.coe.int/team20/cahrom/documents/Glossary%20Roma%20EN%20version%2018%20May%202012.pdf>.
- CoE (Council of Europe), EUMC (European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia). 2003. *Breaking the Barriers – Romani Women and Access to Public Health Care*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- CURS (Center for Urban and Regional Sociology), Romani CRISS (Roma Center for Social Intervention and Studies), REF (Roma Education

- Fund). 2012. *Inequity and Inequality: Teacher Absenteeism, Romani Pupils, and Primary Schools in Romania*. Budapest: Roma Education Fund. http://www.romaeducationfund.hu/sites/default/files/publications/ref_ta_screen_doublepages.pdf.
- EC (European Commission). 2011. "An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020." http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/discrimination/docs/com_2011_173_en.pdf.
- Equality UK and REF (Roma Education Fund). 2011. "From Segregation to Inclusion. Roma Pupils in the United Kingdom. A Pilot Research Project." http://www.romaeducationfund.hu/sites/default/files/publications/ref_uk_report_nov2011_screen_singlepages.pdf.
- ERRC (European Roma Rights Centre). 2000. *Campland: Racial Segregation of Roma in Italy*. Budapest: ERRC.
- . 2004. *Stigmata: Segregated Schooling of Roma in Central and Eastern Europe*. Budapest: ERRC.
- . 2006. *Ambulance Not on the Way: The Disgrace of Health Care for Roma in Europe*. Budapest: ERRC.
- . 2007. *The Glass Box: Exclusion of Roma from Employment*. Budapest: ERRC.
- . 2011. *Standards Do Not Apply: Inadequate Housing in Romani Communities*. Budapest: ERRC.
- . 2012. *Taken From the City: Romanian Roma Evicted to a Rubbish Dump*. Budapest: ERRC.
- Eurobarometer. 2007. *Discrimination in the European Union*. Special Eurobarometer 263. Brussels: European Commission.
- . 2008. *Discrimination in the European Union: Perceptions, Experiences and Attitudes*. Special Eurobarometer 296. Brussels: European Commission.
- FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights). 2009a. "Data in Focus Report. The Roma."
- . 2009b. "Housing conditions of Roma and Travellers in the European Union."
- . 2013. "Roma Pilot Survey. Technical report: methodology, sampling and fieldwork." Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2014-roma-pilot-survey-technical-report_en.pdf.
- FRA and UNDP. 2012. "The Situation of Roma in 11 EU Member States. Survey results at a glance." Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/2099-FRA-2012-Roma-at-a-glance_EN.pdf.
- NIS (National Statistics Institute Romania). 2011a. "Codificarea și centralizarea caracteristicilor privind etnia, respectiv limba maternă a persoanelor înregistrate la R.P.L. 2011" [The coding and centralization of characteristics regarding ethnicity, respectively the mother tongue of the persons registered to R.P.L. 2011]. <http://www.recensamantromania.ro/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/CODIFICAREA-SI-CENTRALIZAREA-ETNIEISI-A-LIMBII-MATERNE-RPL-2011.pdf>.

- . 2011b. *Manualul personalului de recensământ* [Manual for census personnel]. http://www.recensaman.tromania.ro/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/manual-rpl_pag-1-32.pdf.
- ONS (Office for National Statistics, U.K.). 2003. "Census 2001, Summary theme figures and rankings—390,000 Jedi There Are." February 13. http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171780_225970.pdf.
- OSF (Open Society Foundations). 2013. "Roma Health Rights in Macedonia, Romania, and Serbia: A Baseline for Legal Advocacy."
- OSI (Open Society Institute). 2007. *Equal Access to Quality Education for Roma* (vols. 1 and 2). Budapest: Open Society Institute.
- REF (Roma Education Fund). 2009. *School as Ghetto: Systemic Overrepresentation of Roma in Special Education in Slovakia*. Budapest: Roma Education Fund.
- . 2012. *Pitfalls and Bias: Entry Testing and the Overrepresentation of Romani Children in Special Education*. Budapest: Roma Education Fund.
- REF (Roma Education Fund) and Gallup (The Gallup Organization Romania). 2009. *Analysis of the Impact of Affirmative Action for Roma in High Schools, Vocational Schools and Universities*. Budapest: Roma Education Fund.
- Save the Children. 2001. *Denied a Future? The Right to Education of Roma/ Gypsy & Traveller Children in Europe. Vol. 1: South-Eastern Europe*. London: Save the Children.
- UN (United Nations). 1984. *Handbook of Household Surveys*. Revised Edition, Studies in Methods, Series F, No. 31, New York: United Nations.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2002. Andrey Ivanov (lead author). *Avoiding the Dependency Trap*. Bratislava: UNDP.
- . 2004. Andras Blaho (lead author). *Millennium Development Goals: Reducing Poverty and Social Exclusion*. Bratislava: UNDP.
- . 2005. *Faces of Poverty, Faces of Hope: Vulnerability Profiles for "Decade of Roma Inclusion" Countries*. Bratislava: UNDP.
- . 2006a. Andrey Ivanov (lead author). *At Risk: Roma and the Displaced in Southeast Europe*. Bratislava: UNDP.
- . 2006b. *At Risk: The Social Vulnerability of Roma, Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons in Serbia*. Belgrade: UNDP Serbia.
- . 2012. Niall O'Higgins. *Roma and non-Roma in the Labour Market in Central and South Eastern Europe*. Bratislava: UNDP.
- . n. d. "Diversity Management and the UNDP: Revisiting the 'Dependency Trap.'" europeandcis.undp.org/uploads/.../Diversity_Management_at_UNDP.doc.
- UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe). 2011. *The educational attainment, labour market participation and living conditions of young Roma in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania*. http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/oes/disc_papers/ECE_DP_2011-2.pdf.
- UNESCO. *The Race Question*. 1950. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001282/128291eo.pdf>.

- UNICEF (United Nations Children's Fund). 2007. *Breaking the Cycle of Exclusion: Roma Children in South East Europe*. Belgrade: UNICEF Serbia.
- . 2010. *Toward Roma Inclusion: A Review of Roma Education Initiatives in Central and South-Eastern Europe*. Geneva: UNICEF Regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States.
- . 2011. *The Right of Roma Children to Education. Position Paper*. Geneva: UNICEF Regional Office for CEECIS.
- WB (The World Bank). 2000. Dena Ringold. *Roma and the Transition in Central and Eastern Europe: Trends and Challenges*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2002. Ana Revenga, Dena Ringold, and William M. Tracy. *Poverty and Ethnicity: A Cross-country Study of Roma Poverty in Central Europe*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- . 2005. Dena Ringold, Mitchell A. Orenstein, and Erika Wilkens. *Roma in an Expanding Europe: Breaking the Poverty Cycle*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2008. *Czech Republic: Improving Employment Chances of the Roma*. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ECAEXT/Resources/258598-1224622402506/CZ_Roma_Employment_Full_Report.pdf.
- . 2010. "Romania and Serbia. Policy Note." http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRROMA/Resources/Roma_Inclusion_Economic_Opportunity.pdf.
- . 2011. Joost de Laat and Christian Bodewig. "Roma Inclusion is Smart Economics." Washington, DC: World Bank, 1–4.

Name index

(*alphabetical list*)

A

Albania, 22
Anderson, Margo, 109, 113
Arel, Dominique, 6, 114, 116, 119
Ashkali, 22, 96
Asia / Asian / Asiatics, 111, 161,
184–185, 214, 217, 219, 221
Athingani, 23
Australia, 120

B

Balkan, 20, 82
Banton, Michael, 49, 51–52
Barth, Fredrik, 52–53
Barthes, Roland, 226, 229–230, 240
Bavarian, 76
Bertillon, Alphonse, 74
Best, Joel, 105
Bourdieu, Pierre, 6, 27, 29, 31, 43,
46, 52, 54–57, 62, 115, 177, 197,
229
Bowker, C., Geoffrey, 6, 110–112
Boyash, 22, 96, 147
Brazil, 56, 116

Bulgaria, 4, 15, 61–62, 82, 127,
142–146, 193, 195, 199–200,
212–213, 216
Burgdörfer, Friedrich, 107
Burke, Peter, 24, 47, 83, 92, 105

C

Central Institute of Statistics,
Romania, 109, 129
Central and Eastern Europe (CEE),
– *See also* Central and South East
Europe, 2, 4, 20, 34–36, 42, 56,
58, 64, 100–102, 122, 139, 141–
142, 146–147, 151, 161, 166, 168,
180, 185, 191–194, 200, 220,
223, 235–236
Chelcea, Ion, 130–132
Council of Europe (CoE), 16, 55,
78, 100–101, 114, 144, 158–159,
164, 169–170, 172–173, 178,
190, 211–212
Czech Republic – *See also*
Czechoslovakia, 16, 21, 75, 120,
129, 142, 187, 193, 199–200,
220

D

Decade of Roma Inclusion, 61, 223
 Dillmann, Alfred, 76, 78

E

Eastern Europe, 82, 91, 94, 166,
 187, 191, 212–213
 Egyptians, 22–23, 36, 51, 90, 96,
 147
 Erhardt, Sophie, 76
 European Agency for Fundamental
 Rights (FRA), 65, 68, 100–101,
 191, 224–225
 European Commission (EC), 16,
 21, 55, 93, 144, 164, 169, 171–
 172, 191, 224–225, 236
 European Roma and Travellers
 Forum, 96
 European Roma Rights Centre
 (ERRC), 16, 100–101, 164, 169,
 171
 European Union (EU), 21, 29,
 93–94, 96, 100, 102, 137, 166,
 168, 236

F

Fleck, Ludwik, 21
 Foucault, Michel, 5, 16–17, 74, 157
 France, 22, 56, 74–75, 113–114,
 116, 241
 Fraser, Angus, 82, 90, 209

G

Gannett, Lisa, 46, 206–207, 217
 Geertz, Clifford, 48, 88
 Germany, 10, 56, 73–76, 83, 86,
 106–107, 111, 113, 115, 120, 129,
 160
 Gheorghe, Nicolae, 171
 Goffman, Erving, 84, 175–176,
 226–227, 232, 245–246

Google Scholar (GS) 154–156, 160,
 170
 Gould, Stephen Jay, 37, 105, 217,
 220
 Grellmann, Heinrich Moritz
 Gottlieb, 76, 81, 86, 88
 Gresham, David, 203–205, 207,
 209, 211–212, 214
 Griesemer, R., James, 206–207
 Gypsy Lore Society, 88–89

H

Haas, M., Peter, 14, 20
 Hacking, Ian, 5, 25, 27, 32, 39–40,
 84, 118
 Hancock, Ian, 82–83, 108
 Human Genome Project (HGP), 201
 Hungary / Hungarian, 15, 21–22,
 61–64, 67, 75, 91, 129, 135, 142,
 144–145, 183, 185, 193, 213, 220

I

India / Indian, 23, 36–37, 51, 82, 84,
 88–91, 184–185, 188, 203–205,
 208–209, 214, 217, 220, 248–249
 International Business Machines
 Corporation (IBM), 107
 International Romani Union (IRU),
 94–96, 158, 160–161, 171
 Israel, 116–117

J

Jedi, 120–121
 Jenkins, Richard, 40, 47, 52–53
 Jews, 107–109, 116–117, 128, 130,
 205

K

Kahneman, Daniel, 176
 Kalaydjieva, Luba, 203–204, 210–
 212, 215–216

Kertzner, I., David, 6, 114, 116, 119
 Kezdi, Gabor, 64
 Klímová-Alexander, Ilona, 6, 94–95, 158
 Knorr-Cetina, Karin, 8, 28, 31, 175, 177–178
 Kosovo, 22, 147
 Kovats, Martin, xiv, 6, 54, 96–97, 102, 158, 160

L

Ladányi, János, 6, 35, 45, 61–62
 Latour, Bruno, 6, 8, 15, 22, 25, 29–32, 106, 140, 154
 Liègeois, Jean-Pierre, 77–78, 82, 142, 144–147, 170–173, 209
 Lipphardt, Veronika, xiv, 6, 46, 206, 210–211
 Lithuania, 212–213
 Lombroso, Cesare, 74
 Lucassen, Leo, 6, 9, 18, 73, 76, 78, 83–85, 189, 208

M

Macedonia, 22, 147
 Manuilă, Sabin, 109, 128–130
 Mărginean, Ioan, 16
 Marushiakova, Elena, 21, 82–83, 146–147, 209
 Matras, Yaron, 82, 102, 256
 Middle Ages, 9–10, 15, 18–19, 48, 87, 122, 125, 135
 Mills, C., Wright, 36, 38, 43
 Morar, Bharti, 203, 209, 211–212
 Munich, 76

N

National Institute of Statistics
 Romania (NIS), 133, 135–137
 Nazi, 9–10, 76, 83, 87, 107–110, 115, 132, 160–161
 Nuremberg Laws, 110

O

Office for National Statistics (ONS), 120–121
 Okely, Judith, 6, 18–19, 51, 82–83, 89–91, 188, 204, 214
 Open Society Foundations (OSF), xiii, 16, 100–101, 247
 Open Society Institute (OSI), 169, 171, 232
 OSCE, 164, 169, 172

P

Popov, Veselin, xiv, 21, 82–83, 146–147, 209

R

Ritter, Robert, 76, 86
 Roma Education Fund (REF), 100–101, 169, 172, 220, 225, 242, 244
 Romania / Romanian, 3–4, 9–10, 13, 15–16, 19, 22, 35, 47, 58, 61–62, 74–75, 82–83, 87, 107, 109, 113, 117, 122, 124–135, 137–138, 140, 142, 144–145, 147, 149, 159–160, 193, 195, 199–200, 218
 Romanian Principalities, 9, 15, 19, 83, 87, 122–127
 Rudars, 22, 147
 Rughiniș, Cosima, 58, 62–63, 100
 Rushton, J., Philippe, 217, 219

S

Said, Edward, 153
 Second World War, 75, 85, 87, 99, 109–110, 113, 129, 168, 187, 204–205, 210
 Seltzer, William, 109, 113
 Serbia, 22, 67, 120, 147, 199–200, 217–220
 Simhandl, Katrin, 29, 93–94, 171–172
 Simonovits, Gabor, 63–64

Slovakia, 21, 142, 193, 220, 238
South Africa, 10, 106, 110–113
Spain, 144–145, 212–213
Star, S., Leigh, 6, 110–112, 120–121
Stewart, Michael, 6, 51, 88, 91–92,
204
Sweden, 77
Szelényi, Iván, 6, 35, 45, 61–62

T

Tatars, 19, 125
Tübingen, 76
Tversky, Amos, 176

U

UNDP, 65, 77–78, 87, 100–101,
142–144, 169, 171, 178–179,
191–196, 200, 224–225, 233–
234, 239–241, 244, 251
UNHCR, 169, 172, 178
UNICEF, 100–101, 164, 169, 172,
224–225, 233–237, 244
United Kingdom (UK), 74, 83, 89,
91, 120–121, 242

United Nations (UN), 94–95, 158,
171, 192
United States (US), 56, 67, 83, 114–
116, 119, 203, 216, 220, 239

V

Vermeersch, Peter, 6, 32, 97–99,
178, 244

W

Weber, Max, 49–52
Western Europe, 29, 56, 68, 81–85,
93, 101–102, 139, 168, 208, 213,
216, 223
Willems, Wim, 6, 9, 18, 72, 75–76,
82–88, 110, 187, 189, 208
World Bank (WB), 11, 16, 55, 77–
78, 87, 100, 143–144, 156, 164,
168–173, 178–192, 196–200,
224–225, 232–234, 237, 244, 251

Y

Yugoslavia, 16, 129, 216

Once in a while a scholarly book appears that has the power to change academic discourse and public policy. Mihai Surdu's *Those Who Count: Expert Practices of Roma Classification* is one of those. A brilliant scholarly analysis of how Roma population has become objectified into a homogeneous group, characterized in highly repetitive ways, defined by scholars, the mass media, and policy makers only by topics: poverty, lack of education, unemployment, and welfare dependency. What Surdu calls "an iconic depiction of Roma" has served to desensitize us to the differences among Roma and to the commonality of issues that connect Roma to many others. In reading this book, I am reminded of how long it took to shift scholarly analyses of women and minorities away from the constant objectification of them as victims who needed to be helped rather than as activist and engaged citizens determined to change their lives. If you want to rethink the ways in which you see those around you, read *Those Who Count* immediately!

*Marvin Lazerson, Professor Emeritus, University of Pennsylvania and
Professor of Higher Education Policy in the Department of Public Policy,
Central European University*

This outstanding, eye-opening book offers deep insights into how the social sciences have promoted essentialist understandings of a group identity. With admirable clarity, the author methodically demonstrates how quantitative researchers produce "facts" about Roma, facts that circulate easily and contribute significantly to stereotypical thinking in public discourse. These essentializing effects of science are surprising, given the critical constructivist scholarship of the last two decades. However, Mihai Surdu uncovers a much more complex history of academic inquiry across several political and epistemic regimes. Particularly revealing is his analysis of how interwoven academic research was with survey practices of the police, statistical offices, and state administrations. It is especially fascinating to read as Surdu speaks of his first-hand experiences as a social scientist in the 1990s—on which he reflects in a most impressive way. Readers in Science and Technology Studies, History of Science, and far beyond these fields will be thrilled by his analytic framework and compelling arguments against essentialism in the sciences.

*Veronika Lipphardt, Professor of Science and Technology Studies,
University College Freiburg*

Central European University Press

Budapest – New York

Sales and information: ceupress@press.ceu.edu

Website: <http://www.ceupress.com>

ISBN 978 963 386 114 1



9 0 0 0